arXiv:1502.04482v2 [math.CO] 10 Jun 2016

A new proof of Friedman's second eigenvalue Theorem and its extension to random lifts

Charles Bordenave

June 13, 2016

Abstract

It was conjectured by Alon and proved by Friedman that a random d-regular graph has nearly the largest possible spectral gap, more precisely, the largest absolute value of the non-trivial eigenvalues of its adjacency matrix is at most $2\sqrt{d-1}+o(1)$ with probability tending to one as the size of the graph tends to infinity. We give a new proof of this statement. We also study related questions on random n-lifts of graphs and improve a recent result by Friedman and Kohler.

1 Introduction

Consider a finite graph $G = (V, E)$ with $n = |V|$ vertices. Its adjacency matrix A is the matrix indexed by V and defined for all $u, v \in V$ by $A_{uv} = \mathbf{1}(\{u, v\} \in E)$. The matrix A is symmetric, its eigenvalues are real and we order them non-increasingly,

$$\mu_n \leq \ldots \leq \mu_1.$$

We assume further that, for some integer $d \geq 3$, the graph G is d-regular, that is, all vertices have degree d. We then have that $\mu_1 = d$, that all eigenvalues have absolute value at most d, and $\mu_n = -d$ is equivalent to G being bipartite. The absolute value of the largest non-trivial eigenvalues of G is denoted by $\mu = \max\{|\mu_i| : |\mu_i| < d\}$. Classical statements such as Cheeger's isoperimetric inequality or Chung's diameter inequality relate small values of μ or μ_2 with good expanding properties of the graph G, we refer for example to [10, 15]. It turns out that μ cannot be made arbitrarily small. Indeed, a celebrated result of Alon-Boppana implies that for any d-regular graph with n vertices,

$$\mu_2 \geq 2\sqrt{d-1} - \varepsilon_d(n), \tag{1}$$

where, for some constant $c_d > 0$, $\varepsilon_d(n) = c_d / \log n$, see the above references and [26]. Following [21, 19], one may try to construct graphs which achieve the Alon-Boppana bound. A graph is called Ramanujan if $\mu \leq 2\sqrt{d-1}$. Proving the existence of Ramanujan graphs with a large number of vertices is a difficult task which has been solved for arbitrary $d \geq 3$ only recently [20]. On the other end, it was conjectured by Alon [2] and proved by Friedman [12] that most d-regular graphs are weakly Ramanujan. More precisely, for integer $n \geq 1$, we define $\mathcal{G}_d(n)$ as the set of d-regular graphs with vertex set $\{1, \dots, n\}$. If nd is even and $n \geq n_0(d)$ large enough, this set is non-empty. A uniformly sampled d-regular graph is then a random graph whose law is the uniform distribution on $\mathcal{G}_d(n)$.

Theorem 1 (Friedman's second eigenvalue Theorem [12]). *Let $d \geq 3$ be an integer and nd be even with $n \geq n_0(d)$. If G is uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{G}_d(n)$, we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(\mu_2 \vee |\mu_n| \geq 2\sqrt{d-1} + \varepsilon \Big) = 0,$$

where the limit is along any sequence going to infinity with nd even.

The first aim of this paper is to give a new proof of this important result. The argument detailed in Section 2 simplifies substantially the original proof and it allows to take, in this above statement, $\varepsilon = c \log\log n / \log n$ for some large constant $c > 0$ depending on d. The method is quite robust and it has already been recently applied in [7] to random graphs with structures (stochastic block model).

The second aim of this paper is to apply this method to study similar questions on the eigenvalues of random lifts of graphs. This class of models sheds a new light on Ramanujan-type properties, and, since the work of Amit and Linial [3, 4] and Friedman [11], it has attracted a substantial attention [17, 1, 18, 27, 13]. To avoid any confusion in notation, we will postpone to Section 3 the precise definition of random lifts and the statement of the main results. In Section 4 we will give a simpler proof of a recent result of Friedman and Kohler [13] and establish a weak Ramanujan property for the non-backtracking eigenvalues of a random lift of an arbitrary graph.

Notation. If $M \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$, we denote its operator norm by

$$\|M\| = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\|Mx\|_2}{\|x\|_2}.$$

For non-negative sequences a_n, b_n, we will use the standard notation $a_n \sim b_n$, $a_n = O(b_n)$ and $a_n = o(b_n)$. The underlying constants may depend implicitly on the integer $d \geq 3$. Finally, we shall write that an event Ω_n holds with high probability, w.h.p. for short, if $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_n^c) = o(1)$.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

2.1 Overview of the proof

Let us describe the strategy of proof of Theorem 1 and its main difficulties. Following Füredi and Komlós [14] and Broder and Shamir [8], a natural strategy would be to use the trace method.

Namely, if we manage to prove that w.h.p.

$$\mathrm{tr}A^k \leq d^k + n\Big(2\sqrt{d-1} + o(1)\Big)^k. \tag{2}$$

for some even integer $k = k(n)$ such that $k \gg \log n$ then Theorem 1 would follow. Indeed, (2) implies that w.h.p.

$$\mu_2^k + \mu_n^k \leq \mathrm{tr}A^k - d^k \leq n\Big(2\sqrt{d-1} + o(1)\Big)^k.$$

Therefore, w.h.p.

$$\mu_2 \vee |\mu_n| \leq n^{1/k}\Big(2\sqrt{d-1} + o(1)\Big) = 2\sqrt{d-1} + o(1),$$

where the last equality comes from $n^{1/k} = 1 + o(1)$. From Serre [28], we note that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a positive proportion of the eigenvalues of A which are larger than $2\sqrt{d-1}-\varepsilon$, this explains the necessary presence of the factor n on the right hand side of (2). Observe also that the entries of the matrix A^k count the number of paths of length k between two vertices. Since $k \gg \log n$, we are interested in the asymptotic number of closed paths of length k when k is much larger than the typical diameter of the graph.

The presence of d^k on the right hand side of (2) is cumbersome. Alternatively, we may project A on the orthogonal of the eigenvector $\mathbf{1}$ associated to $\mu_1 = d$ and then compute the trace. We should then prove that w.h.p. for some even k, $k \gg \log n$,

$$\mathrm{tr}A^k - d^k = \mathrm{tr}\left(A - \frac{d}{n}J\right)^k \leq n\Big(2\sqrt{d-1} + o(1)\Big)^k, \tag{3}$$

where $J = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^*$ is the $n \times n$ matrix with all entries equal to 1.

The main difficulty hidden behind Friedman's Theorem 1 is that statements (2)-(3) do not hold in expectation for $k \gg \log n$. This is due to the presence of subgraphs in the graph which occur with polynomially small probability. For example, it follows from McKay [23] that for n large enough, the graph contains as subgraph the complete graph with $d+1$ vertices with probability at least n^{-c} for some explicit $c > 0$. On this event, say Ω, the graph is disconnected and $\mu_2 = d$. Hence, for k even,

$$\mathbb{E}\mathrm{tr}A^k - d^k = \mathbb{E}\mathrm{tr}\left(A - \frac{d}{n}J\right)^k \geq d^k\mathbb{P}(\Omega) \geq d^k n^{-c}.$$

For $k \gg \log n$, the right hand side is much larger than $n\big(2\sqrt{d-1} + o(1)\big)^k$. The event Ω is only an example among other unlikely events which prevent statement (2)-(3) to hold in expectation, see [12] for a more detailed treatment of this key issue. In [12], the subgraphs which are responsible of the large expectation of the trace are called *tangles*. In this paper, we will use a simpler definition of the word tangle (Definition 5).

The proof will be organized as follows. First, as in the original Friedman's argument, we will study the spectrum of the non-backtracking matrix B of the graph instead of its adjacency matrix A. Through the Ihara-Bass formula, the eigenvalues of A and B are related by a quadratic equation, and it is easier from a combinatorial viewpoint to count the non-backtracking paths which will appear naturally when taking powers of the matrix B. This step will be performed in §2.2, where will restate Friedman's Theorem in terms of the second largest eigenvalue of the non-backtracking matrix of the random configuration model.

We will not directly apply the trace method to B. We shall fix some integer ℓ of order $\log n$. The second largest eigenvalue of B in absolute value, say λ_2, satisfies,

$$|\lambda_2|^\ell \leq \max_{\langle x, \mathbf{1}\rangle = 0} \frac{\|B^\ell x\|_2}{\|x\|_2}.$$

We will then use the crucial fact that w.h.p. the graph is free of tangles. On this event, we will have the matrix identity

$$B^\ell = B^{(\ell)}$$

where $B^{(\ell)}$ is a matrix where the contribution of all tangles will vanish at once. Thanks to elementary linear algebra, we will then project the matrix $B^{(\ell)}$ on the orthogonal of the vector $\mathbf{1}$ and give a deterministic upper bound of

$$\max_{\langle x, \mathbf{1}\rangle = 0} \frac{\|B^{(\ell)} x\|_2}{\|x\|_2}$$

in terms of the operator norms of new matrices which will be expressed as weighted paths of length at most ℓ. This step is contained in §2.3, it is inspired from Massoulié [22] and was further developed in [7].

In the remainder of the proof, we will aim at using the usual trace method to upper bound the operator norms of these new matrices: if C is such matrix, we will write

$$\mathbb{E}\|C\|^{2m} = \mathbb{E}\|CC^*\|^m \leq \mathbb{E}\mathrm{tr}(CC^*)^m \tag{4}$$

for some integer m of order $\log n / \log\log n$. By construction, the expression on the right hand side is an expected contribution of some weighted paths of lengths $k = 2m\ell$ of order $(\log n)^2/\log\log n$. Hence, in our strategy, we reach a path length of size $k = 2m\ell \gg \log n$ by using an intermediary step where we modify the matrix B^ℓ in order that it vanishes on tangles.

The study of the expected contribution of weighted paths in (4) will have a probabilistic and a combinatorial part. The necessary probabilistic computations on the configuration model are gathered in §2.4, we will notably estimate the expectation of a single weighted path of polynomial length thanks to an exact representation in terms of the confluent hypergeometric function. In §2.5, we will use these computations together with combinatorial upper bounds on non-backtracking paths to deduce sharp bounds on our operator norms. The success of this step will essentially rely on the fact that the contributions of tangles vanish in $B^{(\ell)}$. This step is again inspired by [7]. Finally, in §2.6, we gather all ingredients to conclude.

2.2 The non-backtracking matrix of the configuration model

In this subsection, we will restate Theorem 1 in terms of the spectral gap of the non-backtracking matrix. For the forthcoming probabilistic analysis, we will define in a slightly unusual way this non-backtracking matrix. It will be tuned to the configuration model, this probabilistic model is closely related to the uniform distribution on $\mathcal{G}_d(n)$ and it is simple enough to allow explicit computation, for background, we refer to [6]. To this end, we define the finite sets

$$V = \{1, \dots, n\} \quad \text{and} \quad E = \{(v, i) : v \in V, 1 \leq i \leq d\}.$$

An element of V will be called a vertex and an element of E, a half-edge. The set

$$E(v) = \{(v, i) : 1 \leq i \leq d\}, \tag{5}$$

is thought as a set of half-edges attached to the vertex $v \in V$. If X is a finite set of even cardinal, we define $M(X)$ as the subset of matchings of X, that is permutations σ of X such that for all $x \in X$, $\sigma^2(x) = x$ and $\sigma(x) \neq x$. If $\sigma \in M(E)$, we can classically associate a multi-graph $G = G(\sigma)$, defined through its adjacency matrix $A \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$, by the formula for all $u, v \in V$,

$$A_{uv} = A_{vu} = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sum_{j=1}^{d} \mathbf{1}(\sigma(u, i) = \sigma(v, j)) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mathbf{1}(\sigma(u, i) \in E(v)).$$

Graphically, $G(\sigma)$ is the multi-graph obtained by gluing the half-edges into edges according to the matching map σ.

Observe that $G \in \mathcal{G}_d(n)$ if and only if for all $u \neq v \in V$, $A_{uu} = 0$ and $A_{uv} \in \{0, 1\}$, equivalently $\sigma(E(u)) \cap E(u) = \emptyset$ (no loop) and $|\sigma(E(u)) \cap E(v)| \in \{0, 1\}$ (no multi-edge). It is easy to check that if σ is uniformly distributed on $M(E)$ then the conditional probability measure $\mathbb{P}(G(\sigma) \in \cdot | G(\sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_d(n))$ is the uniform measure on $\mathcal{G}_d(n)$. Importantly, from [6, Theorem 2.16], the following holds

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(G(\sigma) \in \mathcal{G}_d(n)) = e^{-(d^2-1)/4}, \tag{6}$$

The Hashimoto's non-backtracking matrix B of G is an endomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^E$ defined in matrix form, for $e = (u, i)$, $f = (v, j)$ by

$$B_{ef} = \mathbf{1}(\sigma(e) \in E(v) \backslash \{f\}).$$

Alternatively, if M is the permutation matrix associated to σ, defined for all $e, f \in E$ by

$$M_{ef} = M_{fe} = \mathbf{1}(\sigma(e) = f), \tag{7}$$

and N is the endomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^E$ defined in matrix form, for $e = (u, i)$, $f = (v, j)$ by

$$N_{ef} = N_{fe} = \mathbf{1}(u = v; i \neq j), \tag{8}$$

we get easily

$$B = MN. \tag{9}$$

If $m = nd$, we denote by $\lambda_1 \geq |\lambda_2| \geq \ldots \geq |\lambda_m|$ the eigenvalues of B. Let $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^E$ be the vector with all entries equal to 1. Observe that by construction $N\mathbf{1} = (d-1)\mathbf{1}$ and $M\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$. We deduce that

$$B\mathbf{1} = (d-1)\mathbf{1} \quad \text{and} \quad B^*\mathbf{1} = (d-1)\mathbf{1}, \tag{10}$$

Hence, the Perron eigenvalue of B is

$$\lambda_1 = d - 1.$$

The Ihara-Bass formula asserts that if $G \in \mathcal{G}_d(n)$ and $r = |E|/2 - |V| = m/2 - n$,

$$\det(I_E - Bz) = (1 - z^2)^r \det(I_V - Az + (d-1)z^2 I_V), \tag{11}$$

for a proof, we refer to [16, 29]. This formula will be used as a Rosetta Stone between the spectra of A and B: if $\sigma(A)$ and $\sigma(B)$ are the set of eigenvalues of A and B, we get the identity,

$$\sigma(B) = \{\pm 1\} \cup \big\{\lambda : \lambda^2 - \mu\lambda + (d-1) = 0, \mu \in \sigma(A)\big\}. \tag{12}$$

Consequently, from (6)-(12), Theorem 1 is implied by the following statement.

Theorem 2. *Let σ be uniformly distributed on $M(E)$ and λ_2 be the second largest eigenvalue of B. For any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(|\lambda_2| \geq \sqrt{d-1} + \varepsilon\Big) = 0.$$

The remainder of this section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 2.

2.3 Path decomposition

The following elementary lemma is the algebraic ingredient.

Lemma 3. *Let $R, S \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\mathrm{im}(S) \subset \ker(R)$ and $\mathrm{im}(S^*) \subset \ker(R)$. Then, if λ is an eigenvalue of $S + R$ and not an eigenvalue of S,*

$$|\lambda| \leq \max_{x \in \ker(S)} \frac{\|(S+R)x\|_2}{\|x\|_2}.$$

Proof. If $\lambda \neq 0$ is an eigenvalue of $S + R$ and is not eigenvalue of S then it is an eigenvalue of R (indeed, we have $\det(S + R - \lambda) = \det(S - \lambda)\det(I + R(S-\lambda)^{-1})$ and $R(S-\lambda)^{-1} = -\lambda^{-1}R$ since $\mathrm{im}(S) \subset \ker(R)$). Consequently, $|\lambda| \leq \|R\|$. Now, we write $x = y + z$, with $y \in \ker(S)$ and $z \in \ker(S)^\perp$. Since $\ker(S)^\perp = \mathrm{im}(S^*) \subset \ker(R)$, we get $Rx = Ry = (S+R)y$. □

We fix a positive integer ℓ. From (10), we may apply Lemma 3 to the symmetric matrix $S = (d-1)^{\ell}\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^*/(nd)$ and $R = B^{\ell} - S$. We find a Courant-Fisher type inequality,

$$|\lambda_2| \leq \sup_{x:\langle x,\mathbf{1}\rangle=0,\|x\|_2=1} \|B^{\ell}x\|_2^{1/\ell}, \tag{13}$$

where we recall that λ_2 is the second largest eigenvalue of B. The right hand side of the above expression can be studied by an expansion of paths in the graph. To this end, we will use some definitions for the sequences $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k) \in E^k$ which we will naturally encounter to express the entries of B^{ℓ} as a count of non-backtracking paths in the graph.

Definition 4. *For a positive integer k, let $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k) \in E^k$, with $\gamma_t = (v_t, i_t)$.*

- *The sequence γ is* admissible *if for all $t \geq 1$, $\gamma_{2t-1} \neq \gamma_{2t}$. The set of admissible sequence is denoted by Π^k.*
- *If $\gamma \in \Pi^k$, the set of visited vertices and pairs of half-edges are denoted by $V_\gamma = \{v_t : 1 \leq t \leq k\}$ and $E_\gamma = \{\{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\} : 1 \leq t \leq k/2\}$. We denote by G_γ the multi-graph with vertex set V_γ and edges given by E_γ, that is $\{\{v_{2t-1}, v_{2t}\} : 1 \leq t \leq k/2\}$.*
- *The sequence $\gamma \in \Pi^k$ is a* non-backtracking path *if for all $t \geq 1$, $v_{2t+1} = v_{2t}$ and $\gamma_{2t+1} \neq \gamma_{2t}$ (that is $N_{\gamma_{2t}\gamma_{2t+1}} = 1$, where N was defined by (8)). The set Γ^k is the set of non-backtracking paths. If $e, f \in E$, we denote by Γ^k_{ef} paths in Γ^k such that $\gamma_1 = e$, $\gamma_k = f$, and similarly for Π^k_{ef}.*

We will use the convention that a product over an empty set is equal to 1 and the sum over an empty set is 0. By construction, for integer $k \geq 0$, from (9) we find that

$$(B^k)_{ef} = \sum_{\gamma\in\Pi^{2k+1}_{ef}} \prod_{s=1}^{k} M_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}} N_{\gamma_{2s}\gamma_{2s+1}} = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma^{2k+1}_{ef}} \prod_{s=1}^{k} M_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}},$$

where M is the permutation matrix associated to σ defined by (7). Note that, in the above expression for B^k, we have pulled apart the configuration and combinatorial parts: the set Γ^{2k+1} does not depend on σ, only the summand depends on it. We set

$$\underline{M}_{ef} = M_{ef} - \frac{1}{dn}. \tag{14}$$

Observe that $\underline{M}$ is the orthogonal projection of M on $\mathbf{1}^{\perp}$. Also $N\mathbf{1} = (d-1)\mathbf{1}$ and N is symmetric. Hence, setting $\underline{B} = \underline{M}N$, we get from (9) that, if $x \in \mathbf{1}^{\perp}$,

$$B^k x = \underline{B}^k x. \tag{15}$$

Moreover, using $(\underline{B})^k = (\underline{M}N)^k$, we find

$$(\underline{B}^k)_{ef} = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma^{2k+1}_{ef}} \prod_{s=1}^{k} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}},$$

The matrix $\underline{B}$ will not be used in our analysis. As pointed in §2.1, due to polynomially small events which would have had a big influence on the expected value of B^k or $\underline{B}^k$ in the forthcoming probabilistic analysis, we will first reduce the above sum over Γ^{2k+1}_{ef} to a sum over a smaller subset. We will only afterward project on $\mathbf{1}^\perp$, it will create some extra remainder terms. Following [12, 9, 25, 7], we introduce a central definition.

Definition 5 (Tangles)**.** *A multi-graph H is* tangle-free *if it contains at most one cycle (loops and multi-edges count as cycles), H is* ℓ-tangle-free *if every neighborhood of radius ℓ in H contains at most one cycle. Otherwise, H is tangled or ℓ-tangled. We say that an admissible $\gamma \in E^k$ is tangle-free or tangled if G_γ is. Finally, F^k and F^k_{ef} will denote the subsets of tangle-free paths in Γ^k and Γ^k_{ef}.*

Obviously, if G is ℓ-tangle-free and $0 \leq k \leq \ell$ then

$$B^k = B^{(k)}, \tag{16}$$

where

$$(B^{(k)})_{ef} = \sum_{\gamma \in F^{2k+1}_{ef}} \prod_{s=1}^{k} M_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}}.$$

For $0 \leq k \leq \ell$, we define similarly the matrix $\underline{B}^{(k)}$ on $\mathbb{R}^E$ by

$$(\underline{B}^{(k)})_{ef} = \sum_{\gamma \in F^{2k+1}_{ef}} \prod_{s=1}^{k} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}}. \tag{17}$$

Beware that it is not true that if G is ℓ-tangle-free and $2 \leq k \leq \ell$ that $\underline{B}^k = \underline{B}^{(k)}$. Nevertheless, at the cost of extra terms, as in (15), we will express $B^{(\ell)}x$ in terms of $\underline{B}^{(\ell)}x$ for all $x \in \mathbf{1}^\perp$. We start with the following telescopic sum decomposition:

$$(B^{(\ell)})_{ef} \quad = \quad (\underline{B}^{(\ell)})_{ef} + \sum_{\gamma \in F^{2\ell+1}_{ef}} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \prod_{s=1}^{k-1} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}} \left(\frac{1}{dn}\right) \prod_{k+1}^{\ell} M_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}}, \tag{18}$$

which follows from the identity,

$$\prod_{s=1}^{\ell} x_s = \prod_{s=1}^{\ell} y_s + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \prod_{s=1}^{k-1} y_s (x_k - y_k) \prod_{k+1}^{\ell} x_s.$$

We now rewrite (18) as a sum of matrix products for lower powers of $\underline{B}^{(k)}$ and $B^{(k)}$ up to some remainder terms. In words, we may decompose a path $\gamma \in \Gamma^{2\ell+1}_{ef}$ as a path in $\Gamma^{2k-1}_{e\gamma_{2k-1}}$, a path in $\Gamma^3_{\gamma_{2k-1},\gamma_{2k+1}}$ and a path in $\Gamma^{2(\ell-k)+1}_{\gamma_{2k+1}f}$. If the path is in $F^{2\ell+1}_{ef}$ (that is, it is tangle-free), then the three paths are tangle-free, but the reciprocal is not necessarily true. This will be the origin of the remainder terms. We denote by K the matrix on $\mathbb{R}^E$ defined by

$$K = (d-1)\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^* - N.$$

Observe that $K_{ef} \in \{d-1, d-2\}$ is the cardinal of $\Gamma^3_{ef} = F^3_{ef}$. As pointed above, we need to consider paths which can be decomposed in tangle-free paths but which are not tangled-free. To this end, for $1 \leq k \leq m-1$, $T^m_k \subset E^m$ is the set of $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_m)$ such that, if $\gamma_s = (v_s, i_s)$, (i) $\gamma' = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k) \in F^k$, (ii) $\gamma'' = (\gamma_{k+1}, \ldots, \gamma_m) \in F^{m-k}$, (iii) $G_{\gamma'} \cup G_{\gamma''} \cup \{v_k, v_{k+1}\}$ is tangled (if $v_k = v_{k+1}$, $\{v_k, v_{k+1}\}$ is a loop edge). Then, if $T^m_{k,ef}$ is the subset of $\gamma \in T^m_k$ such that $\gamma_1 = e$ and $\gamma_m = f$, we set

$$(R^{(\ell)}_k)_{ef} = \sum_{\gamma \in T^{2\ell}_{2k-1,ef}} \alpha(\gamma) \prod_{s=1}^{k-1} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}} \prod_{s=k}^{\ell-1} M_{\gamma_{2s}\gamma_{2s+1}}, \tag{19}$$

with $\alpha(\gamma) = K_{\gamma_{2k-1}\gamma_{2k}}$. Summing over γ_{2k} in (18) and setting $\gamma'_t = \gamma_{t-1}$ for $t \geq 2k+1$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} B^{(\ell)} &= \underline{B}^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \underline{B}^{(k-1)} K B^{(\ell-k)} - \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} R^{(\ell)}_k \\ &= \underline{B}^{(\ell)} + \frac{d-1}{dn} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \underline{B}^{(k-1)} \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^* B^{(\ell-k)} - \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \underline{B}^{(k-1)} N B^{(\ell-k)} - \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} R^{(\ell)}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that if G is ℓ-tangle free, then, from (10)-(16) , $\mathbf{1}^* B^{(\ell-k)} = (d-1)^{\ell-k} \mathbf{1}^*$. Hence, if G is ℓ-tangle free and $\langle x, \mathbf{1} \rangle = 0$, $\|x\|_2 = 1$, we find

$$\|B^\ell x\|_2 \leq \|\underline{B}^{(\ell)}\| + \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \|\underline{B}^{(k-1)}\| (d-1)^{\ell-k+1} + \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \|R^{(\ell)}_k\|,$$

where we have used that $\|B^k\| = (d-1)^k$ and $\|N\| = d-1$ (indeed N is a $\{0,1\}$-matrix with $d-1$ non zeros entries on each row). Putting this last inequality in (13), the outcome of this subsection in the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *Let $\ell \geq 1$ be an integer and $\sigma \in M(E)$ be such that $G(\sigma)$ is ℓ-tangle free. Then,*

$$|\lambda_2| \leq \left(\|\underline{B}^{(\ell)}\| + \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \|\underline{B}^{(k)}\| (d-1)^{\ell-k} + \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \|R^{(\ell)}_k\| \right)^{1/\ell}.$$

2.4 Computation on the configuration model

The configuration model allows some explicit probabilist computation. In the remainder of this section, $G = G(\sigma)$ where σ is uniform on $M(E)$. Our first lemma checks that G is ℓ-tangle free if ℓ is not too large. An alternative argument can be extracted from [24] (with a different method).

Lemma 7. *Let $\ell \sim \kappa \log_{d-1} n$ with $\kappa < 1/4$. Then w.h.p. G is ℓ-tangle free.*

Proof. We fix $v \in V$ and build a process which sequentially reveals the neighborhood of v. Informally, this process updates a set D_t of half-edges $e \in E$ which are in the neighborhood of v but whose matched half-edge $\sigma(e)$ has not been revealed yet. We start by the half-edges in $E(v)$ (which was defined by (5)) and then the half-edges which share a vertex with an half-edge in $\sigma(E(v))$ and so on. It is defined formally as follows. As stage 0, we start with $D_0 = E(v) \subset E$. At stage $t \geq 0$, if D_t is not empty, take an element e_{t+1} in D_t which has been added at the earliest possible stage (we break ties with lexicographic order). Let $f_{t+1} = \sigma(e_{t+1}) = (u_{t+1}, j_{t+1})$. If $f_{t+1} \in D_t$, we set $D_{t+1} = D_t \backslash \{e_{t+1}, f_{t+1}\}$, and, otherwise,

$$D_{t+1} = (D_t \cup E(u_{t+1})) \backslash \{e_{t+1}, f_{t+1}\}.$$

At stage $\tau \leq dn$, D_τ is empty and we have explored the connected component of v. Before stage

$$m = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} d(d-1)^{k-1} = O\Big((d-1)^\ell\Big),$$

we have revealed the subgraph spanned by the vertices at distance at most ℓ from v. Also, if v has two distinct cycles in its ℓ-neighborhood, then $S(v) = S_{\tau \wedge m} \geq 2$. where, for $t \geq 1$,

$$S_t = \sum_{s=1}^{t} \varepsilon_s \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_t = \mathbf{1}(f_t \in D_{t-1}).$$

At stage $t \geq 0$, $2t$ values of σ have been discovered (namely $\sigma(e_s)$ and $\sigma(f_s)$ for $1 \leq s \leq t$) and we have

$$|D_t| = d + \sum_{s=1}^{t} (d-2)(1-\varepsilon_s) - 2\sum_{s=1}^{t} \varepsilon_s = (t+1)d - 2t - dS_t.$$

We will denote by $\mathcal{F}_t$ the σ-algebra generated by $(D_0, \cdots, D_t)$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}_t}$ the condition probability distribution. Then, τ is a stopping time and, if $t < \tau \wedge m$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}_t}(\varepsilon_{t+1} = 1) = \frac{|D_t| - 1}{nd - 2t - 1} \leq c\Big(\frac{m}{n}\Big) = q.$$

Hence, $S(v)$ is stochastically dominated by a $\mathrm{Bin}(m, q)$ variable. Now, recall that the probability that $\mathrm{Bin}(m, q)$ is not in $\{0, 1\}$ is at most $q^2 m(m-1) \leq q^2 m^2$. In particular, from the union bound,

$$\mathbb{P}(G \text{ is } \ell\text{-tangled}) \leq \sum_{v=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(S(v) \geq 2) \leq \sum_{v=1}^{n} q^2 m^2 = O\Big(\frac{(d-1)^{4\ell}}{n}\Big).$$

It concludes the proof of Lemma 7. $\square$

The next crucial proposition implies that the variables $\underline{M}_{ef}$ defined by (14) are nearly centered and almost independent. As in Definition 4, for $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_k) \in E^k$, we say that an edge $\{e, f\} \in E_\gamma$ is *consistent* if $\{t : e \in \{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\} \text{ or } f \in \{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\}\} = \{t : \{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\} = \{e, f\}\}$. It is inconsistent otherwise. The *weight* of an edge $y \in E_\gamma$ is $\sum_t \mathbf{1}(\{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\} = y)$. In words, an edge is consistent in γ if its half-edges are uniquely paired together, and the weight of an edge is the number of times that it is visited on the path.

Proposition 8. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for any admissible $\gamma \in E^{2k}$ with $k \leq \sqrt{dn}$ and any $k_0 \leq k$, we have,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{t=1}^{k_0} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}} \prod_{t=k_0+1}^{k} M_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}} \right| \leq c\, 9^b \left(\frac{1}{dn}\right)^a \left(\frac{4k}{\sqrt{dn}}\right)^{a_1},$$

where $a = |E_\gamma|$, b is the number of inconsistent edges of γ and a_1 is the number of $1 \leq t \leq k_0$ such that $\{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\}$ is a consistent edge of weight 1 in E_γ.

The important part in Proposition 8 is the factor $(4k/\sqrt{dn})^{a_1}$, it reflects the weak centering and independence when $k = o(\sqrt{n})$. This term would be absent if the absolute value in Proposition 8 would have been inside the expectation. We will use the Pochhammer symbol, for non-negative integers n, k,

$$(n)_k = \prod_{t=0}^{k-1} (n - t).$$

Recall the convention that a product over an emptyset is equal to 1. We will use that, if $k(k \vee t) \leq \alpha n$, $k \vee t \leq n/2$,

$$(n)_k \geq e^{-2\alpha} n^k \quad \text{and} \quad (n-t)^k \geq e^{-2\alpha} n^k, \tag{20}$$

(indeed, $(n)_k \geq (n-k)^k$ and $(n-t)^k = n^k \exp(k \log(1 - t/n)) \geq n^k \exp(-2kt/n)$ since $\log(1-x) \geq -x/(1-x)$ for $0 \leq x < 1$).

We start with a lemma which could be stated alternatively in terms of the confluent hypergeometric function.

Lemma 9. *Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, $0 < p < 1$ and N be a $\mathrm{Bin}(k,p)$ variable, if $q \geq p$ and $4(1 - p/q)^2 \leq 2qk^2 \leq 1$, we have*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{n=1}^{N} \left(n - \frac{1}{q}\right) \right| \leq 4(3k\sqrt{q})^k.$$

Proof. Let $f(x) = \mathbb{E} \prod_{n=1}^{N} (n - 1/x)$, $\delta = q/(q-1)$ and $\varepsilon = (1 - p/q)/(1-p)$. We write

$$f(q) = \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} p^t (1-p)^{k-t} \prod_{n=1}^{t} \left(n - \frac{1}{q}\right) = (1-p)^k \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} (-1 + \varepsilon)^t \prod_{n=0}^{t-1} (1 + \delta n).$$

We note that the function f can be expressed in terms of the confluent hypergeometric function, that is $f(q) = p^k U(-k, 1/q - k, 1/p - 1)$. The lemma is then a consequence of known asymptotic, we will however give an elementary proof. We write

$$\prod_{n=0}^{t-1} (1 + \delta n) = 1 + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \delta^s \sum_{(s)} \prod_{i=1}^{s} n_i = 1 + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \delta^s P_s(t),$$

where $\sum_{(s)}$ is the sum over all $(n_i)_{1\leq i\leq s}$ all distinct and $1\leq n_i\leq t-1$. We observe that $t\mapsto P_s(t)$ is a polynomial of degree $2s$ in t and for $t\geq 1$, $P_s(t)\leq (t-1)^{2s}$, (there are $(t-1)_s$ elements in $\sum_{(s)}$ and each of them is bounded by $(t-1)_s$). We set $P_0(t)=1$, we deduce that

$$|f(q)|\leq\left|\sum_{s=0}^{k-1}\delta^s\sum_{t=0}^{k}\binom{k}{t}(-1)^t(1-\varepsilon)^tP_s(t)\right|. \tag{21}$$

There are cancellations in the above sum if $\varepsilon=0$ (that is $q=p$). Consider the derivative of order m of $(1+x)^k=\sum_{t=0}^{k}\binom{k}{t}x^t$. It vanishes at $x=-1$ for any $0\leq m\leq k-1$. We get that for any $0\leq m\leq k-1$,

$$0=\sum_{t=0}^{k}\binom{k}{t}(-1)^t(t)_m.$$

Since $Q_t:x\mapsto(x)_t$ is a monic polynomial of degree t, $Q_0,\dots,Q_{k-1}$ is a basis of $\mathbb{R}_{k-1}[x]$. It follows by linearity that for any polynomial P of degree at most $k-1$,

$$0=\sum_{t=0}^{k}\binom{k}{t}(-1)^tP(t). \tag{22}$$

We use that P_s is a polynomial of degree $2s$, we deduce from (21) evaluated at $q=p$ that

$$\begin{aligned}|f(p)| &\leq \sum_{s=\lfloor(k-1)/2\rfloor+1}^{k-1}|\delta|^s\sum_{t=0}^{k}\binom{k}{t}|P_s(t)|\\ &\leq \sum_{s=\lfloor(k-1)/2\rfloor+1}^{\infty}|\delta|^s2^k(k-1)^{2s}\\ &\leq 2(2k\sqrt{p})^k,\end{aligned}$$

where at the last line, we have that $|\delta|(k-1)^2\leq pk^2\leq 1/2$. It proves the lemma when $p=q$. More generally, if $0\leq\varepsilon<1$, the same computation gives

$$\sum_{s=\lfloor(k-1)/2\rfloor+1}^{k-1}|\delta|^s\sum_{t=0}^{k}\binom{k}{t}|1-\varepsilon|^t|P_s(t)| \leq 2(2k\sqrt{q})^k,$$

For $1\leq s\leq\lfloor(k-1)/2\rfloor$, we may exploit (22) by using Taylor formula in $0\leq\varepsilon<1$,

$$(1-\varepsilon)^t=\sum_{r=0}^{t}(-\varepsilon)^r\binom{t}{r}=T_{k,s}(t)+R_{k,s}(t).$$

where $T_{k,s}(t)=\sum_{r=0}^{k-1-2s}(-\varepsilon)^r\binom{t}{r}$ is a polynomial in t of degree $k-1-2s$ and

$$|R_{k,s}(t)|\leq\varepsilon^{k-2s}\binom{t}{k-2s}\leq 2^t\varepsilon^{k-2s}.$$

We get from (22) that

$$\sum_{s=0}^{\lfloor (k-1)/2 \rfloor} \delta^s \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} (-1)^t (1-\varepsilon)^t P_s(t) \quad = \quad \sum_{s=0}^{\lfloor (k-1)/2 \rfloor} \delta^s \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} (-1)^t R_{k,s}(t) P_s(t).$$

Taking absolute values, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{s=0}^{\lfloor (k-1)/2 \rfloor} \delta^s \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} (-1)^t (1-\varepsilon)^t P_s(t) \right| &\leq \sum_{s=0}^{\lfloor (k-1)/2 \rfloor} |\delta|^s \sum_{t=0}^{k} \binom{k}{t} 2^t \varepsilon^{k-2s} (k-1)^{2s} \\ &\leq 3^k \varepsilon^k \sum_{s=0}^{\lfloor (k-1)/2 \rfloor} |\delta|^s (k-1)^{2s} \varepsilon^{-2s} \\ &\leq 2(3k\sqrt{q})^k, \end{aligned}$$

where at the last line, we have used that $|\delta|(k-1)^2\varepsilon^{-2} \geq qk^2(1-p/q)^{-2} \geq 2$. From (21), it concludes the proof of the lemma. □

We will use the following elementary lemma on conditional expectations.

Lemma 10. *Let T, $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}, (x_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be random variables defined on a common probability space with T a non-negative integer variable and X_t, x_t real variables. Let $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(T, (x_s)_s, (X_s)_{s\neq t})$ be the σ-algebra generated by all variables but X_t. We assume that $|\mathbb{E}(X_0|\mathcal{F}_0)| \leq x_0$ and for $t \geq 1$, $\mathbb{E}(|X_t||\mathcal{F}_t) \leq x_t$. Then,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{t=0}^{T} X_t \right| \leq \mathbb{E} \prod_{t=0}^{T} x_t.$$

Proof. By conditioning on the value of T, we may assume without loss of generality that T is deterministic. We write $\mathbb{E} \prod_{t=0}^{T} X_t = \mathbb{E}\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{t=0}^{T} X_t | \mathcal{F}_0\Big)\Big) = \mathbb{E}\Big(\mathbb{E}(X_0|\mathcal{F}_0) \prod_{t=1}^{T} X_t\Big)$. Hence, from Jensen inequality and our assumptions, $\left|\mathbb{E} \prod_{t=0}^{T} X_t\right| \leq \mathbb{E}\Big(x_0 \prod_{t=1}^{T} |X_t|\Big)$. Now, let $\mathcal{G}_t = \sigma((x_s)_s, (X_s)_{s<t})$, since $\mathcal{G}_T \subset \mathcal{F}_T$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(x_0 \prod_{t=1}^{T} |X_t| \right) = \mathbb{E}\left(x_0 \prod_{t=1}^{T-1} |X_t| \mathbb{E}(|X_T||\mathcal{G}_T) \right) = \mathbb{E}\left(x_0 \prod_{t=1}^{T-1} |X_t| \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(|X_T||\mathcal{F}_T)\mathcal{G}_T) \right)$$

Applying our assumption, we find, since $x_T \in \mathcal{G}_T$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(x_0 \prod_{t=1}^{T} |X_t| \right) \leq \mathbb{E}.\left(x_0 x_T \prod_{t=1}^{T-1} |X_t| \right).$$

We then repeat the above step. □

Proof of Proposition 8. We first assume that all edges are consistent. The proof relies on a careful conditional expectation argument. We set $E_\gamma = \{y_1, \dots, y_a\}$ and $y_t = \{e_t, f_t\}$. Note that $e_t \neq f_t$ since γ is admissible. We also set $m = dn$ and

$$E^* = E \backslash \bigcup_{1 \leq t \leq a} \{e_t, f_t\}.$$

In particular, since all edges are consistent, $|E^*| = m - 2a$. The weight of y_t is equal to $p_t + q_t$, where p_t is the weight of y_t in $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{2k_0})$ and q_t its weight in $(\gamma_{2k_0+1}, \dots, \gamma_{2k})$. We have

$$I = \prod_{t=1}^{k_0} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}} \prod_{t=k_0+1}^{k} M_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}} = \prod_{t=1}^{a} \underline{M}^{p_t}_{e_t f_t} M^{q_t}_{e_t f_t}.$$

For integer p, we introduce the sets $T_p = \{t : p_t = p, q_t = 0\}$ and $T' = \{t : q_t \geq 1\}$, T_p is the set of edges with weight p and which does not appear in $(\gamma_{2k_0+1}, \dots, \gamma_{2k})$. By assumption $|T_1| = a_1$. Observe that $\cup_{p \geq 1} T_p \cup T'$ is a partition of E_γ. Also, since $M_{ef} \in \{0, 1\}$, if $q_t \geq 1$, then $\underline{M}^{p_t}_{e_t f_t} M^{q_t}_{e_t f_t} = (1 - 1/m)^{p_t} M_{e_t f_t} = (1 - 1/m)^{p_t} \mathbf{1}(\sigma(e_t) = f_t)$. We find

$$I = \mathbf{1}_\Omega \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right)^h \prod_{p \geq 1} \prod_{t \in T_p} \underline{M}^p_{e_t f_t}, \tag{23}$$

where $h = \sum_{t \in T'} p_t$ and $\Omega = \{\forall t \in T', \sigma(e_t) = f_t\}$. In order to study the expectation of (23), we will find a formula for a conditional average of the product $\prod_{t \in T_1} \underline{M}_{e_t f_t}$. To this end, we will condition on the set of edges in $y_t \in T_1$ which have an half-edge (e_t or f_t) which is a matched with an half-edge of another edge $y_s \in E_\gamma$. More precisely, for $p \geq 1$, we further define S_p as the set of $t \in T_1$ such that for some $s \in T_p \backslash \{t\}$, $\sigma(y_t) \cap y_s \neq \emptyset$, where $\sigma(y_t) = \{\sigma(e_t), \sigma(f_t)\}$. Also, $\hat{S}_p$ is the set of $t \in T_p$ such that $\sigma(y_t) \cap y_s \neq \emptyset$ for some $s \in T_1 \backslash \{t\}$. We have $S_1 = \hat{S}_1$. We set $T_1^* = T_1 \backslash \cup_p S_p$ and for $p \geq 2$, $T_p^* = T_p \backslash \hat{S}_p$. Finally, δ is the number of $t \in T_1$ which belong to $S_p \cap S_q$ for some $1 \leq p < q$. We have the relation, for $p \geq 2$,

$$|T_p^*| = |T_p| - |\hat{S}_p|, \qquad |T_1^*| = a_1 - \sum_{p \geq 1} |S_p| + \delta, \qquad a - a_1 = |T'| + \sum_{p \geq 2} |T_p|.$$

Thus, (23) may be rewritten as

$$I = \mathbf{1}_\Omega \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right)^h \left(-\frac{1}{m}\right)^{\sum_p (p|\hat{S}_p| + |S_p|) - \delta - |\hat{S}_1|} \prod_{p \geq 1} \prod_{t \in T_p^*} \underline{M}^p_{e_t f_t}, \tag{24}$$

(the term $-|\hat{S}_1|$ comes from $S_1 = \hat{S}_1$). Now, we define $\mathcal{F}$ the σ-algebra generated by the variables T_1^* and $\sigma(e_t), \sigma(f_t), t \notin T_1^*$. By construction, for $t \in T_1$, the events Ω and $\{t \in T_1^*\}$ are $\mathcal{F}$-measurable. If $\hat{N}$ is the number of $t \in T_1^*$ such that $\sigma(e_t) \neq f_t$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \prod_{t \in T_1^*} \underline{M}_{e_t, f_t} \quad = \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right)^{|T_1^*| - \hat{N}} \left(-\frac{1}{m}\right)^{\hat{N}}.$$

Let $\hat{m} = m - 2a - \sum_{p\geq 2}\sum_{t\in T_p^*}(\mathbf{1}(\sigma(e_t)\in E^*) + \mathbf{1}(\sigma(f_t)\in E^*))$ be the cardinal of half-edges in E^* which have not yet been matched when the value of $\sigma(e_t), \sigma(f_t), t\notin T_1^*$ has been revealed and Ω holds. If Ω holds, the law of $\hat{N}$ given $\mathcal{F}$ is given by a direct counting argument: for $0\leq x\leq |T_1^*|$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}}(\hat{N} = x) = \frac{\binom{|T_1^*|}{x}(\hat{m})_x}{Z} \quad \text{with} \quad Z = \sum_{x=0}^{|T_1^*|}\binom{|T_1^*|}{x}(\hat{m})_x.$$

First, since $\hat{m}\geq m-4a$ and $a\leq\sqrt{m}$, we obtain from (20)

$$Z \geq c\sum_{x=0}^{|T_1^*|}\binom{|T_1^*|}{x}\hat{m}^x = c(1+m)^{|T_1^*|} \geq cm^{|T_1^*|}.$$

From what precedes, we get, if Ω holds,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}}\prod_{t\in T_1^*}\underline{M}_{e_t,f_t} &= \frac{1}{Z}\sum_{x=0}^{|T_1^*|}\binom{|T_1^*|}{x}(\hat{m})_x\left(1-\frac{1}{m}\right)^{|T_1^*|-x}\left(-\frac{1}{m}\right)^x \\
&= \frac{1}{Z}\sum_{x=0}^{|T_1^*|}\binom{|T_1^*|}{x}\prod_{y=0}^{x-1}(y-\hat{m})\left(1-\frac{1}{m}\right)^{|T_1^*|-x}\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^x \\
&= \frac{1}{Z}\mathbb{E}\prod_{y=0}^{N-1}(y-\hat{m}),
\end{aligned}$$

where N has distribution $\text{Bin}(|T_1^*|, 1/m)$. By Lemma 9, we deduce that, if Ω holds,

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}}\prod_{t\in T_1^*}\underline{M}_{e_t,f_t}\right| \leq c\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)^{|T_1^*|},$$

with $\varepsilon = 4a/\sqrt{m}$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{F}_t$ be the σ-algebra generated by $\sigma(e_s), \sigma(f_s), s\neq t$. For any $1\leq t\leq a$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}_t}(M_{e_tf_t} = 1) = \frac{\mathbf{1}(\Omega_t^c)}{m-2a+1} \leq \frac{1}{m^*}, \tag{25}$$

where $m^* = m-2a+1$ and $\Omega_t\in\mathcal{F}_t$ is the event that for some $s\neq t$, $\sigma(e_s)$ or $\sigma(f_s)$ is in $\{e_t, f_t\}$. We get, for $p\geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_t}|\underline{M}_{e_tf_t}|^p \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_t}|\underline{M}_{e_tf_t}|^2 \leq \left(1-\frac{1}{m}\right)^2\frac{1}{m^*} + \frac{1}{m^2}\left(1-\frac{1}{m^*}\right) \leq \frac{1}{m^*}.$$

If $\mathcal{F}'$ is the σ-algebra generated by $\sigma(e_t), \sigma(f_t), t\notin T'$, the above argument gives,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}'}(\Omega) \leq \left(\frac{1}{m^*}\right)^{|T'|}.$$

Putting these bounds together, we deduce from Lemma 10, (20) and (24) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E}I| &\leq c\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^{|T'|}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^{\sum_p(p|\hat{S}_p|+|S_p|)-\delta-|\hat{S}_1|}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)^{|T_1^*|}\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^{\sum_{p\geq 2}|T_p^*|} \\
&= c\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^{a-a_1}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)^{a_1}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)^{-\sum_p|S_p|+\delta}\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^{\sum_p(p|\hat{S}_p|+|S_p|)-\delta-\sum_p|\hat{S}_p|} \\
&\leq c\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^{a-a_1}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)^{a_1}\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^{\sum_{p\geq 2}(p|\hat{S}_p|-\frac{1}{2}|S_p|)-\sum_{p\geq 2}|\hat{S}_p|}\varepsilon^{-|S_1|},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $1/\sqrt{m} \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$. For each t, there exist s, s' such that $\sigma(y_t) \subset y_s \cup y_{s'}$, hence, we have $|\hat{S}_p| \geq |S_p|/2$, and we get

$$\sum_{p\geq 2}(p|\hat{S}_p| - \frac{1}{2}|S_p|) - \sum_{p\geq 2}|\hat{S}_p| = \sum_{p\geq 2}(|\hat{S}_p| - \frac{1}{2}|S_p|) + \sum_{p\geq 2}(p-1)|\hat{S}_p| - \sum_{p\geq 2}|\hat{S}_p| \geq 0.$$

We deduce that

$$|\mathbb{E}I| \leq c\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^{a-a_1}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{m}\right)^{a_1}\mathbb{E}\varepsilon^{-|S_1|}.$$

It remains to upper bound the expectation on the right hand side. The event that $\{|S_1| \geq x\}$ is contained in the event that there are $\lceil x/2 \rceil$ pairs $\{s,t\}$, s,t in T_1, such that $\sigma(y_s) \cap y_t \neq \emptyset$ (the latter can be further decomposed in the union of the four events, $\sigma(e_s) = e_t$, $\sigma(e_s) = f_t$, $\sigma(f_s) = e_t$ or $\sigma(f_s) = f_t$). Arguing as in (25), we find from the union bound and (20),

$$\mathbb{P}(|S_1| \geq x) \leq (4a_1^2)^{\lceil x/2 \rceil}\left(\frac{1}{m^*}\right)^{\lceil x/2 \rceil} \leq c\left(\frac{4a^2}{m}\right)^{\lceil x/2 \rceil} = c\left(\frac{2a}{\sqrt{m}}\right)^{2\lceil x/2 \rceil},$$

(the term $(4a_1^2)^{\lceil x/2 \rceil}$ accounts for the choice of the possible half-edges to be matched). Recalling $\varepsilon = 4a/\sqrt{m}$, we find

$$\mathbb{E}\varepsilon^{-|S_1|} \leq \sum_{x=0}^{\infty}\varepsilon^{-x}\mathbb{P}(|S_1| \geq x) \leq c\sum_{x=0}^{\infty}2^{-x}\left(\frac{2a}{\sqrt{m}}\right)^{2\lceil x/2 \rceil - x} \leq c\left(\frac{2a}{\sqrt{m}} \vee 1\right)\sum_{x=0}^{\infty}2^{-x} \leq c'.$$

From what precedes, it proves that $|\mathbb{E}I| \leq c(1/m)^{a-a_1}(\varepsilon/m)^{a_1}$. It concludes the proof of Proposition 8 when all edges are consistent.

We now extend this result to the case of inconsistent edges. Let us say that $e \in E$ is an inconsistent half-edge of γ of degree $\delta \geq 2$, if there are δ half-edges, $h_1, \cdots, h_\delta$, such that for all $1 \leq i \leq \delta$, $\{e, h_i\}$ is in E_γ. The degree of inconsistency of γ is defined as the sum of the degrees of inconsistent half-edges. The degree of inconsistency of γ, say $\hat{b}$, is at most $2b$. We use the above notation $E_\gamma = \{y_1, \ldots, y_a\}$, $y_t = \{e_t, f_t\}$ and p_t, q_t and T' as above. Assume that e_1 is an inconsistent half-edge. Then there exists another edge, say y_2, such that, without loss of generality $e_2 = e_1$ and $f_2 \neq f_1$. Observe that $M_{y_1}M_{y_2} = 0$, hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{M}_{y_1}^{p_1}\underline{M}_{y_2}^{p_2} &= \left(M_{y_1} - \frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_1}\left(M_{y_2} - \frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_2} \\
&= \left(M_{y_1} - \frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_1}\left(-\frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_2} + \left(-\frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_1}\left(M_{y_2} - \frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_2} - \left(-\frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_1+p_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\underline{M}_{y_1}^{p_1} M_{y_1}^{q_1} \underline{M}_{y_2}^{p_2} \quad = \quad M_{y_1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_1} \left(-\frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_2}.$$

We have then decomposed (23) into at most 3 terms of the form, with $i \neq j \in \{1, 2\}$

$$\left(-\frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_j} \underline{M}_{y_i}^{p_i} \prod_{t \notin T', t>2} \underline{M}_{y_t}^{p_t} \prod_{t \in T', t>2} M_{y_t}, \qquad -\left(-\frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_1+p_2} \prod_{t \notin T', t>2} \underline{M}_{y_t}^{p_t} \prod_{t \in T', t>2} M_{y_t},$$

$$\text{or} \quad \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_i} \left(-\frac{1}{m}\right)^{p_j} M_{y_i} \prod_{t \notin T', t>2} \underline{M}_{y_t}^{p_t} \prod_{t \in T', t>2} M_{y_t}.$$

Moreover, by construction, in each term, the degree of inconsistency is at most $\hat{b} - 1$. By repeating this for all inconsistent half-edges, we have decomposed (23) into less than $3^{\hat{b}} \leq 9^b$ terms of the form (23) with $a' = a - b'$ edges, all consistent, multiplied by a factor $\pm(1 - 1/m)^h m^{-b''}$ with $b'' \geq b'$, $h \geq 0$. Applying the first part of the proposition to each term, the conclusion follows. □

2.5 Path counting

In this subsection, we give upper bounds on the operator norms of $\underline{B}^{(k)}$ and R_ℓ^k defined by (17) and (19). We will use the trace method and it will lead us to enumerate some paths.

2.5.1 Operator norm of $\underline{B}^{(k)}$

In this paragraph, we prove the following proposition.

Proposition 11. *If $1 \leq \ell \leq \log n$, w.h.p. for any $0 \leq k \leq \ell$,*

$$\|\underline{B}^{(k)}\| \leq (\log n)^{15} (d-1)^{k/2}.$$

Let m be a positive integer. With the convention that $e_{2m+1} = e_1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\underline{B}^{(k)}\|^{2m} = \|\underline{B}^{(k)} \underline{B}^{(k)*}\|^m \quad &\leq \quad \mathrm{tr}\left\{ \left(\underline{B}^{(k)} \underline{B}^{(k)*} \right)^m \right\} \\ &= \sum_{e_1, \ldots, e_{2m}} \prod_{i=1}^{m} (\underline{B}^{(k)})_{e_{2i-1}, e_{2i}} (\underline{B}^{(k)})_{e_{2i+1}, e_{2i}} \\ &= \sum_{\gamma} \prod_{i=1}^{2m} \prod_{t=1}^{k} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{i,2t-1} \gamma_{i,2t}}, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where the sum is over all $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{2m})$ such that $\gamma_i = (\gamma_{i,1}, \ldots, \gamma_{i,2k+1}) \in F^{2k+1}$ and for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$,

$$\gamma_{2i,1} = \gamma_{2i+1,1} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{2i-1,2k+1} = \gamma_{2i,2k+1},$$

with the convention that $\gamma_{2m+1} = \gamma_1$. Note that the product (26) does not depend on the value of $\gamma_{i,2k+1}$, $1 \leq i \leq 2m$. Note also that, if $\gamma_{i,2k}$ is given, $\gamma_{i,2k+1}$ can take $(d-1)$ possible values. Hence, by setting $\gamma'_{2i,t} = \gamma_{2i,2k+1-t}$ we may rewrite the right hand side of (26) as

$$\|\underline{B}^{(k)}\|^{2m} \leq (d-1)^m \sum_{\gamma \in W_{k,m}} \prod_{i=1}^{2m} \prod_{t=1}^{k} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{i,2t-1}\gamma_{i,2t}}, \tag{27}$$

where $W_{k,m}$ is the set of $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{2m}) \in \Pi^{2k \times 2m}$ such that $\gamma_i = (\gamma_{i,1}, \ldots, \gamma_{i,2k}) \in F^{2k}$ and for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$,

$$v_{2i,1} = v_{2i-1,2k} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{2i+1,1} = \gamma_{2i,2k}, \tag{28}$$

with the convention that $\gamma_{2m+1} = \gamma_1$ and $\gamma_{i,t} = (v_{i,t}, j_{i,t})$. For each $\gamma \in W_{k,m}$, we define G_γ as in Definition 4, $V_\gamma = \cup_i V_{\gamma_i} = \{v_{i,t} : 1 \leq i \leq 2m, 1 \leq t \leq 2k\} \subset V$ and $E_\gamma = \cup_i E_{\gamma_i} = \{\{\gamma_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t}\} : 1 \leq i \leq 2m, 1 \leq t \leq k\}$ are the sets of visited vertices and visited pairs of half-edges along the path. For $v \in V_\gamma$, $E_\gamma(v) = \{\gamma_{i,t} : v_{i,t} = v \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq 2m, 1 \leq t \leq 2k\} \subset E_v$ is the set of visited half-edges pending at v. Importantly, G_γ is connected.

The proof of Proposition 11 is based on an upper bound on the expectation of the right hand side of (27). First, in order to organize this expectation of a large sum, we partition $W_{k,m}$ in equivalence classes. Permutations on vertices and half-edges act naturally on $W_{k,m}$. We consider the isomorphism class $\gamma \sim \gamma'$ if there exist a permutation $\sigma \in S_V$ and permutations $(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n) \in S_d^n$ such that, with $\gamma'_{i,t} = (v'_{i,t}, j'_{i,t})$, for all $1 \leq i \leq 2m$, $1 \leq t \leq 2k$, $v'_{i,t} = \sigma(v_{i,t})$ and $j'_{i,t} = \sigma_{v_{i,t}}(j_{i,t})$. We may define a canonical element in each isomorphic class as follows. We say that a path $\gamma \in W_{k,m}$ is canonical if $V_\gamma = \{1, \ldots, |V_\gamma|\}$, for all $v \in V_\gamma$, $E_\gamma(v) = \{(v,1), \ldots, (v, |E_\gamma(v)|)\}$ and the vertices in V_γ and the the half-edges in $E_\gamma(v)$ are visited in the lexicographic order (x before $x+1$ and (x,j) before $(x, j+1)$). Our first lemma bounds the number of paths in each isomorphic class.

Lemma 12. *Let $\gamma \in W_{k,m}$ and $c = d/(d-1)$. If $|V_\gamma| = s$ and $|E_\gamma| = a$, then γ is isomorphic to at most $cn^s(d(d-1))^a$ paths in $W_{k,m}$.*

Proof. For $v \in V_\gamma$, let $d_v = |E_\gamma(v)|$ and, for $1 \leq t \leq d$ integer, we set $(d)_t = d(d-1)\cdots(d-t+1)$. Observe that, if $s_t = \sum_{v \in V_\gamma} \mathbf{1}(d_v = t)$, we have

$$\sum_{t \geq 1} s_t = s \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{t \geq 1} t s_t = 2a.$$

By construction, γ is isomorphic to

$$N = \binom{n}{s} \prod_{v=1}^{s} (d)_{d_v} \leq n^s \prod_{t \geq 1} {(d)_t}^{s_t}$$

distinct elements in $W_{k,m}$. However,

$$\prod_{t \geq 1} {(d)_t}^{s_t} \leq d^{\sum_t s_t} (d-1)^{\sum_{t \geq 1} (t-1) s_t} = d^s (d-1)^{2a-s} = (d(d-1))^a \left(\frac{d}{d-1}\right)^{s-a}.$$

Finally, since the graph G_γ is connected, we have $s \leq a+1$. □

Our second lemma gives a rough upper bound on the number of isomorphic classes. This lemma is a variant of [7, Lemma 17]. It will rely crucially on the fact that an element $\gamma \in W_{k,m}$ is composed of $2m$ tangle-free paths.

Lemma 13. *Let $\mathcal{W}_{k,m}(s,a)$ be the subset of canonical paths with $|V_\gamma| = s$ and $|E_\gamma| = a$. We have*

$$|\mathcal{W}_{k,m}(s,a)| \leq (2dkm)^{6m(a-s+1)+6m}.$$

Proof. In order to upper bound $|\mathcal{W}_{k,m}(s,a)|$, we need to find an efficient way to encode the canonical paths $\gamma \in \mathcal{W}_{k,m}(s,a)$ (that is, find an injective map from $\mathcal{W}_{k,m}(s,a)$ to a larger set whose cardinal is easily upper bounded).

For $i \leq i \leq 2m$ and $1 \leq t \leq k$, let $x_{i,t} = (\gamma_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t})$ and $y_{i,t} = \{\gamma_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t}\} \in E_\gamma$. We will call $y_{i,t}$ an edge of γ. We explore the sequence $(x_{i,t})$ in lexicographic order denoted by $\preceq$ (that is $(i,t) \preceq (i+1,t')$ and $(i,t) \preceq (i,t+1)$). We think the index (i,t) as a time. We say that (i,t) is a *first time*, if $v_{i,2t}$ has not been seen before (that is $v_{i,2t} \neq v_{i',t'}$ for all $(i',t') \preceq (i,2t)$). The edge $y_{i,t}$ will then be called a *tree edge*. As its name suggests, the graph, spanned by the edges $\{\{v_{i,2t-1}, v_{i,2t}\} : (i,t) \text{ first time}\}$ is a tree. An edge $y_{i,t}$ which is not a tree edge, is called an *excess edge* and we say that (i,t) is an *important time*. Since every vertex in V_γ different from 1 has its associated tree edge,

$$\chi = |\{y \in E_\gamma : \ y \text{ is an excess edge}\}| = a - s + 1. \tag{29}$$

By construction, the path γ_i can be decomposed by the successive repetition of (i) a sequence of first times (possibly empty), (ii) an important time and (iii) a path on the tree defined so far (possibly empty). Note also that, if (i,t) is a first time then $\gamma_{i,2t} = (m+1,1)$ where m is the number of previous first times. Indeed, since γ is canonical, $\gamma_{1,1} = (1,1)$ and every time time that a new vertex, say v, is visited, the half-edge $(v,1)$ will be seen first. Moreover, if $(i,t), (i,t+1), \cdots, (i,t+p)$ are first times, with m as above, then $\gamma_{i,2t} = (m+1,1)$ and $x_{i,t+p} = ((m+p,2),(m+p+1,1))$ (since γ_i is non-backtracking in the sense of Definition 4).

We can now build a first encoding of $\mathcal{W}_{k,m}(s,a)$. If (i,t) is an important time, we mark the time (i,t) by the vector $(j_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t}, \gamma_{i,2\tau-1})$, where (i,τ) is the next time that $y_{i,\tau}$ will not be a tree edge of the tree constructed so far (by convention, if the path γ_i remains on the tree and $\gamma_{i,2k+1} = \gamma_{i+1,1}$). From (28), for $t = 1$, we also add the *starting mark* $(j_{i,1}, \gamma_{i,2\tau-1})$ where, as above, where (i,τ) is the next time that $y_{i,\tau}$ will not be a tree edge of the tree constructed so far. Since their is a unique non-backtracking path between two vertices of a tree, we can reconstruct $\gamma \in \mathcal{W}_{k,m}$ from the starting marks and the position of the important times and their marks. It gives rise to our first encoding.

The main issue with this encoding is that the number of important times could be large. We have however not used so far the hypothesis that each path γ_i is tangle-free. To this end, we are going to partition important times into three categories, *short cycling*, *long cycling* and *superfluous* times. For each i, we consider the first time (i,t_1) such that $v_{i,2t_1} \in \{v_{i,1},\dots,v_{i,2t_1-1}\}$. If such time t_1 exists, the last important time $(i,t) \preceq (i,t_1)$ will be called the short cycling time. Let $1 \leq \sigma \leq t_1$ be such that $v_{i,2t_1} = v_{i,2\sigma-1}$. By assumption, $C_i = (\gamma_{i,2\sigma-1},\cdots,\gamma_{i,2t_1})$ will be the unique cycle visited by γ_i. We denote by $(i,\hat{t})$, $\hat{t} \geq t_1$, the first time that $\gamma_{i,2\hat{t}-1}$ in not in C_i (by convention $\hat{t} = k+1$ if γ_i remains on C_i). We modify the mark of the short cycling time as $(j_{i,2t-1},\gamma_{i,2t},v_{i,2t_1},\hat{t},\gamma_{i,2\hat{\tau}-1})$, where $(i,\hat{\tau})$, $\hat{\tau} \geq \hat{t}$, is the next time that $y_{i,\hat{\tau}}$ will not be a tree edge of the tree constructed so far. Important times (i,t') with $1 \leq t' < t$ or $\tau \leq t' \leq k$ are called long cycling times. The other important times are called superfluous. The key observation is that for each $1 \leq i \leq 2m$, the number of long cycling times on γ_i is bounded by $\chi - 1$ (since there is at most one cycle, no edge of E_γ can be seen twice outside those of C_i, the -1 coming from the fact the short cycling time is an excess edge).

We now have our second encoding. We can reconstruct γ from the starting marks, the positions of the long cycling and the short cycling times and their marks. For each i, there are at most 1 short cycling time and $\chi-1$ long cycling times. There are at most $k^{2m\chi}$ ways to position them. There are at most $d(ds)^2 = d^3s^2$ different possible marks for a long cycling time and $ds(ds)^2k = d^3s^3k$ marks for a short cycling time. Finally, there are $d(ds) = d^2s$ possibilities for a starting mark. We deduce that

$$|\mathcal{W}_{k,m}(s,a)| \leq k^{2m\chi}(d^3s^3k)^{2m}(d^3s^2)^{2m(\chi-1)}(d^2s)^{2m}.$$

Using $s \leq 2km$, the last expression is generously bounded by the statement of the lemma. $\square$

For $\gamma \in W_{k,m}$, the average contribution of γ in (27) is

$$\mu(\gamma) = \mathbb{E}\prod_{i=1}^{2m}\prod_{t=1}^{k}\underline{M}_{\gamma_{i,2t-1}\gamma_{i,2t}}. \tag{30}$$

Observe that if $\gamma \sim \gamma'$ then $\mu(\gamma) = \mu(\gamma')$. Our final lemma will use Proposition 8 to estimate this average contribution.

Lemma 14. *There is a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that, if $2km \leq \sqrt{dn}$ and $\gamma \in W_{k,m}$ with $|V_\gamma| = s$, $|E_\gamma| = a$, we have*

$$|\mu(\gamma)| \leq \kappa^{a-s+1+m}\left(\frac{1}{dn}\right)^{a}\left(\frac{(8km)^2}{dn}\right)^{(2s-a-2-(k+2)m)_+}.$$

Proof. Let E_1' be the set of $y \in E_\gamma$ which are visited exactly once in γ, that is such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2m}\sum_{t=1}^{k}\mathbf{1}(y = \{\gamma_{i,2t-1},\gamma_{i,2t}\}) = 1.$$

We set $a_1' = |E_1'|$. Similarly, let a_2 the number of $y \in E_\gamma$ are visited at least twice. We have

$$a_1' + a_2 = a \quad \text{and} \quad a_1' + 2a_2 \leq 2km.$$

Therefore, $a_1' \geq 2(a - km)$. Let E_1 be the subset of $y \in E_1'$ which are consistent and let E_* the set of inconsistent edges (recall the definition above Proposition 8). Using the terminology of the proof of Lemma 13, a new inconsistent edge can appear at the the start of a sequence of first times, at a first visit of an excess edge or at the first step of γ_i, $i \in [2m]$. Every such step can create 2 inconsistent edges. Hence, from (29), if $a_1 = |E_1|$ and $b = |E_*|$, we have $b \leq 4(a - s + 1) + 4m$ and $a_1 \geq a_1' - 4(a - s + 1) - 4m$. So finally, $a_1 \geq 2(2s - a - 2 - (k + 2)m)$. It remains to apply Proposition 8. □

Proof of Proposition 11. For $n \geq 3$, we define

$$m = \left\lfloor \frac{\log n}{13 \log(\log n)} \right\rfloor . \tag{31}$$

For this choice of m, $n^{1/(2m)} = o(\log n)^7$ and $km = o(\log n)^2$. Hence, from (27) and Markov inequality, it suffices to prove that

$$S = \sum_{\gamma \in W_{k,m}} |\mu(\gamma)| \leq n(ckm)^{6m}(d-1)^{k'm}, \tag{32}$$

where $k' = k + 2$ and $\mu(\gamma)$ was defined in (30). Since the graph G_γ of $\gamma \in W_{k,m}$ is connected, $|V_\gamma| - 1 \leq |E_\gamma|$. Using Lemma 12, Lemma 13 and Lemma 14, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \sum_{a=s-1}^{\infty} \max_{\gamma \in \mathcal{W}_{k,m}(s,a)} |\{\gamma' \in W_{k,m} : \gamma' \sim \gamma\}| \times |\mathcal{W}_{k,m}(s,a)| \times \max_{\gamma \in \mathcal{W}_{k,m}(s,a)} \mu(\gamma) \\ &\leq \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \sum_{a=s-1}^{\infty} cn^s (d(d-1))^a (2dkm)^{6m(a-s+1)+6m} \kappa^{a-s+1+m} \left(\frac{1}{dn}\right)^a \left(\frac{(8km)^2}{dn}\right)^{(2s-a-2-k'm)_+} \\ &\leq S_1 + S_2 + S_3, \end{aligned}$$

where S_1 is the sum over $\{1 \leq s \leq k'm, s - 1 \leq a\}$, S_2 over $\{k'm + 1 \leq s, s - 1 \leq a \leq 2s - 2 - k'm\}$, and S_3 over $\{k'm + 1 \leq s, 2s - 1 - k'm \leq a\}$. We have for some constant $c' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\leq cn\kappa^m (2dkm)^{6m} \sum_{s=1}^{k'm} (d-1)^{s-1} \sum_{a=s-1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\kappa(d-1)(2dkm)^{6m}}{n}\right)^{a-s+1} \\ &\leq n(c'km)^{6m}(d-1)^{k'm} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{c'(2dkm)^{6m}}{n}\right)^p . \end{aligned}$$

For our choice of m in (31), for n large enough,

$$\frac{(2dkm)^{6m}}{n} \leq \frac{(\log n)^{12m}}{n} \leq n^{-1/13}.$$

In particular, the above geometric series converges and, adjusting the value of c, the right hand side of (32) is an upper bound for S_1. Similarly, with $\varepsilon = (8km)^2/dn = o(1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &\leq cn\kappa^m(2dkm)^{4m} \sum_{s=k'm+1}^{\infty} (d-1)^{s-1}\varepsilon^{s-1-(k+1)m} \sum_{a=s-1}^{2s-2-k'm} \left(\frac{\kappa(d-1)(2dkm)^{6m}}{\varepsilon n}\right)^{a-s+1} \\ &\leq n(c'km)^{4m} \sum_{s=k'm+1}^{\infty} (d-1)^{s-1}\left(\frac{c'(2dkm)^{6m}}{n}\right)^{s-1-k'm} \\ &= n(c'km)^{4m}(d-1)^{k'm}\sum_{p=0}^{\infty}(d-1)^p\left(\frac{c'(2dkm)^{6m}}{n}\right)^{p}. \end{aligned}$$

Again, the geometric series are convergent and the right hand side of (32) is an upper bound for S_2. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} S_3 &\leq cn\kappa^m(2dkm)^{4m} \sum_{s=k'm+1}^{\infty} (d-1)^{s-1} \sum_{a=2s-1-k'm}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\kappa(d-1)(2dkm)^{6m}}{n}\right)^{a-s+1} \\ &\leq n(c'km)^{4m} \sum_{s=k'm+1}^{\infty} (d-1)^{s-1}\left(\frac{c'(2dkm)^{6m}}{n}\right)^{s-k'm} \\ &= n(c'km)^{4m}(d-1)^{k'm}\sum_{p=0}^{\infty}(d-1)^p\left(\frac{c'(2dkm)^{6m}}{n}\right)^{p+1}. \end{aligned}$$

The right hand side of (32) is an upper bound for S_3. It concludes the proof. □

2.5.2 Operator norm of $R_k^{(\ell)}$

We now adapt the above paragraph for the treatment of $R_k^{(\ell)}$.

Proposition 15. *If $1 \leq \ell \leq \log n$, w.h.p. for any $1 \leq k \leq \ell$,*

$$\|R_k^{(\ell)}\| \leq (\log n)^{25}(d-1)^{\ell-k/2}.$$

Let m be a positive integer. We use the definition of $R_k^{(\ell)}$ in (19). Arguing as in (26), we find

$$\|R_k^{(\ell)}\|^{2m} \leq \sum_{\gamma} \alpha(\gamma) \prod_{i=1}^{2m}\prod_{t=1}^{k-1} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{i,2t-1}\gamma_{i,2t}} \prod_{t=k}^{\ell-1} M_{\gamma_{i,2t}\gamma_{i,2t+1}}, \tag{33}$$

where the sum is over all $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{2m})$ such that $\gamma_i = (\gamma_{i,1}, \ldots, \gamma_{i,2\ell}) \in T_{2k-1}^{2\ell}$, $\alpha(\gamma) = \prod_{i=1}^{2m}\alpha(\gamma_i)$, and for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$,

$$\gamma_{2i,1} = \gamma_{2i+1,1} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{2i-1,2\ell} = \gamma_{2i,2\ell},$$

with the convention that $\gamma_{2m+1} = \gamma_1$. The product (33) does not depend on the value of $\gamma_{i,2\ell}$, $1 \leq i \leq 2m$ and it depends on $\gamma_{i,2k-1}$ only through $\alpha(\gamma_i) = K_{\gamma_{i,2k-1}\gamma_{i,2k}} \in \{d-2, d-1\}$. Hence, setting $\gamma'_{2i,t} = \gamma_{2i,2\ell-t}$ and summing over $\gamma_{i,2\ell}$, $\gamma_{i,2k-1}$, we find

$$\|R^{(\ell)}_k\|^{2m} \quad \leq \quad \sum_{\gamma \in X^k_{\ell,m}} \beta(\gamma) \prod_{i=1}^{2m} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell-1} M^{(i,t)}_{\gamma_{i,2t-1}\gamma_{i,2t}}, \tag{34}$$

where $X^k_{\ell,m}$ is the set of $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{2m}) \in \Pi^{2(\ell-1)\times 2m}$ such that for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, $\gamma_{2i-1} \in T^{2\ell-2}_{2k-2}$, $\gamma_{2i} \in T^{2\ell-2}_{2\ell-2k}$, $v_{2i,1} = v_{2i-1,2\ell-2}$ and $\gamma_{2i+1,1} = \gamma_{2i,2\ell-2}$, with the convention that $\gamma_{2m+1} = \gamma_1$ and $\gamma_{i,t} = (v_{i,t}, j_{i,t})$. Finally, $M^{(i,t)}_{ef} = \underline{M}_{ef}$ if i is odd and $t \leq k-1$ or i even and $t \geq \ell - k + 1$, otherwise $M^{(i,t)}_{ef} = M_{ef}$. The constant $\beta(\gamma)$ could be explicited but it will not be necessary. We will only use that

$$|\beta(\gamma)| \leq (d-1)^{5m} \leq c^m. \tag{35}$$

For $1 \leq i \leq 2m$ odd, we set $k_i = k$ and for i even $k_i = \ell - k + 1$. Let $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_{2m}) \in X^k_{\ell,m}$. We write $\gamma_i = (\gamma'_i, \gamma''_i)$ where, $\gamma'_i = (\gamma_{i,1}, \dots, \gamma_{i,2k_i-2})$ and $\gamma''_i = (\gamma_{i,2k_i-1}, \dots, \gamma_{i,2\ell-2})$. By definition γ'_i and γ''_i are tangle-free but $G_{\gamma'_i} \cup G_{\gamma''_i} \cup \{\gamma_{i,2k_i-2}, \gamma_{i,2k_i-1}\}$ is tangled. It follows that either G_{γ_i} is a connected graph with a cycle or both $G_{\gamma'_i}$ and $G_{\gamma''_i}$ contain a cycle. Notably, any connected component of G_γ has a cycle, it follows,

$$|V_\gamma| \leq |E_\gamma|. \tag{36}$$

As in the previous paragraph, we consider the isomorphism classes on $X^k_{\ell,m}$. Using (36), the proof of lemma 12 gives immediately the next statement.

Lemma 16. *Let $\gamma \in X^k_{\ell,m}$. If $|V_\gamma| = s$ and $|E_\gamma| = a$, then γ is isomorphic to at most $n^s(d(d-1))^a$ paths in $X^k_{\ell,m}$.*

We have the following upper bound on the number of isomorphism classes. This lemma is a variant of [7, Lemma 18].

Lemma 17. *Let $\mathcal{X}^k_{\ell,m}(s,a)$ be the subset of canonical paths with $|V_\gamma| = s$, $|E_\gamma| = a$. We have*

$$|\mathcal{X}^k_{\ell,m}(s,a)| \leq (2d\ell m)^{12m(a-s+1)+12m}.$$

Proof. We adapt the proof of Lemma 13 and use the same terminology. For $1 \leq i \leq 2m$ odd, we set $k_i = k$ and for i even $k_i = \ell - k + 1$. To each i, we say that γ_i is connected or disconnected whether $G_{\gamma''_i}$ intersects the graph $H_i = \cup_{j<i} G_{\gamma_j} \cup G_{\gamma'_i}$ or not. If γ_i is disconnected, we define for $1 \leq t \leq \ell - 1$, $x_{i,t} = (\gamma_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t})$. If γ_i is connected, for $1 \leq t \leq k_i - 1$, we set $x_{i,t} = (\gamma_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t})$, and if $\sigma_i \geq k_i$ is the first time such that $v_{i,2\sigma_i} \in H_i$, we set for $k_i \leq t \leq \sigma_i$, $x_{i,t} = (\gamma_{i,2(\sigma_i+k_i-t)}, \gamma_{i,2(\sigma_i+k_i-t)-1})$ and for $\sigma_i + 1 \leq t \leq \ell - 1$, $x_{i,t} = (\gamma_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t})$. We then explore the sequence $(x_{i,t})$ in lexicographic order. The definition of $y_{i,t}$, first time, tree edge and excess edge carry over, that is (i,t) is a first time if the end vertex of $x_{i,t}$ has not been seen before. When γ_i is connected, we add the extra mark $(\sigma_i, \gamma_{i,2\sigma_i}, \gamma_{i,2\tau-1})$ where (i,τ), $\tau > \sigma_i$, is the next time that $y_{i,t}$ will not be a tree edge of the tree constructed so far. If γ_i is disconnected this extra mark is set to 0. With our ordering, all vertices of $V_\gamma \backslash \{1\}$ will have an associated tree edge, at the exception of $v_{i,2k_i-1}$ when γ_i is disconnected. If δ is the number of disconnected γ_i's, we deduce that there are $\delta + a + s - 1$ excess edges. Note however that there are at most $\chi = a + s - 1$ excess edges in each connected component of G_γ.

We may now repeat the proof of Lemma 13. The main difference is that, for each i, we use that γ'_i and γ''_i are tangled free, it gives short cycling times and long cycling times for both γ'_i and γ''_i. Then, for each i, there are at most 2 short cycling times and $2(\chi - 1)$ long cycling times. Since there are at most $\ell^{4m\chi}$ ways to position them, we get that

$$|\mathcal{X}^k_{\ell,m}(s,a)| \le (\ell d^3 s^2)^{2m} \ell^{4m\chi} (d^3 s^3 \ell)^{4m} (d^2 s^2)^{4m(\chi-1)} (d^2 s)^{2m},$$

where the factor $(\ell d^2 s^2)^{2m}$ accounts for the extra marks. Using $s \le 2\ell m$, we obtain the claimed statement. $\square$

For $\gamma \in X^k_{\ell,m}$, the average contribution of γ in (27) is

$$\nu(\gamma) = \mathbb{E} \prod_{i=1}^{2m} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell-1} M^{(i,t)}_{\gamma_{i,2t-1}\gamma_{i,2t}}.$$

Lemma 18. *There is a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that, if $2\ell m \le \sqrt{dn}$ and $\gamma \in X^k_{\ell,m}$ with $|V_\gamma| = s$, $|E_\gamma| = a$, we have*

$$|\nu(\gamma)| \le \kappa^{a-s+1+m} \left(\frac{1}{dn}\right)^a \left(\frac{(8\ell m)^2}{dn}\right)^{(2s-a-2-(2\ell-k+6)m)_+}.$$

Proof. We adapt the proof of Lemma 14. Let E^0_1 be the set of $y \in E_\gamma$ which are visited exactly once in γ and $a^0_1 = |E^0_1|$. If a_2 is the number of $y \in E_\gamma$ which are visited at least twice, we have $a^0_1 + a_2 = a$ and $a^0_1 + 2a_2 \le 2(\ell-1)m$. Therefore, $a^0_1 \ge 2(a - (\ell-1)m)$. Now, let E'_1 be the subset of $y = \{\gamma_{i,2t-1}\gamma_{i,2t}\}$ in E^0_1 such that $M^{(i,t)}_{ef} = \underline{M}_{ef}$. If $a'_1 = |E'_1|$, we find $a'_1 \ge a^0_1 - 2m(\ell-k)$. Now, let E_1 be the subset of $y \in E^0_1$ which are consistent and let E_* the set of inconsistent edges. In each connected component of G_γ, each excess edge can give rise to at most four elements in E_*, the starting edges $\gamma_{i,1}$ at most 2, and, if γ_i is connected, the intersection time (i, σ_i) to at most 4. Hence, if $a_1 = |E_1|$ and $b = |E_*|$, we have $b \le 4(a-s+1) + 12m$ and $a_1 \ge a'_1 - 4(a-s+1) - 12m$. So finally, $a_1 \ge 2(2s - a - 2 - (2\ell - k + 6)m)$. It remains to apply Proposition 8. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 15. For $n \ge 3$, we define

$$m = \left\lfloor \frac{\log n}{25 \log(\log n)} \right\rfloor. \tag{37}$$

For this choice of m, $\ell m = o(\log n)^2$. Hence, from (34)-(35) and Markov inequality, it suffices to prove that for some constant $c > 0$,

$$S = \sum_{\gamma \in X^k_{\ell,m}} |\nu(\gamma)| \le (c\ell m)^{24m} (d-1)^{k'' m}, \tag{38}$$

with $k'' = 2\ell - k + 6$. Using (36), Lemma 16, Lemma 17 and Lemma 18, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \sum_{s=1}^{\infty}\sum_{a=s}^{\infty} n^s (d(d-1))^a (2d\ell m)^{12m(a-s+1)+12m} \kappa^{a-s+1+m} \left(\frac{1}{dn}\right)^a \left(\frac{(8\ell m)^2}{dn}\right)^{(2s-a-2-k''m)_+} \\ &\leq S_1 + S_2 + S_3, \end{aligned}$$

where S_1 is the sum over $\{1 \leq s \leq k''m, s \leq a\}$, S_2 over $\{k''m + 1 \leq s \leq a \leq (2s - 2 - k''m)\}$, and S_3 over $\{k''m + 1 \leq s, 2s - 1 - k''m \leq a\}$. We may then repeat the proof of Proposition 11 where k'' replaces k'. For example, for some constant $c > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\leq \kappa^{m+1} (2d\ell m)^{24m} \sum_{s=1}^{k''m} (d-1)^s \sum_{a=s}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\kappa (d-1)(2d\ell m)^{12m}}{n} \right)^{a-s} \\ &\leq (c\ell m)^{24m} (d-1)^{k''m} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{c(2d\ell m)^{12m}}{n} \right)^p . \end{aligned}$$

For our choice of m in (37), we have, for n large enough, $(2d\ell m)^{12m}/n \leq n^{-1/25}$. Hence, the above geometric series converges and the right hand side of (38) is an upper bound for S_1. The treatment of S_2 and S_3 is exactly parallel to the treatment of S_2 and S_3 in the proof of Proposition 11. It concludes the proof. □

2.6 Proof of Theorem 2

All ingredients are finally gathered. We fix $\ell \sim \kappa \log_{d-1} n$ for some $0 < \kappa < 1/4$. By Lemma 7 and Lemma 6, if Ω is the event that $G(\sigma)$ is ℓ-tangle free,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\Big(|\lambda_2| \geq \sqrt{d-1} + \varepsilon \Big) &= \mathbb{P}\Big(|\lambda_2| \geq \sqrt{d-1} + \varepsilon ; \Omega \Big) + o(1) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\Big(J^{1/\ell} \geq \sqrt{d-1} + \varepsilon \Big) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$J = \|\underline{B}^{(\ell)}\| + \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \|\underline{B}^{(k)}\| (d-1)^{\ell-k} + \frac{1}{dn} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \|R_k^{(\ell)}\|.$$

On the other end, by Propositions 11-15, w.h.p.

$$\begin{aligned} J &\leq (\log n)^{15} (d-1)^{\ell/2} + \frac{(\log n)^{15}}{dn} \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} (d-1)^{\ell-k/2} + \frac{(\log n)^{25}}{dn} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} (d-1)^{\ell-k/2} \\ &\leq (\log n)^{15} (d-1)^{\ell/2} + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

since $(d-1)^{\ell} = O(n^{\kappa})$. Finally, for our choice of ℓ, $(\log n)^{15/\ell} = 1 + O(\log \log n / \log n)$. It concludes the proof.

Remark 1. *Proposition 15 is stronger than our needs in the proof of Theorem 2. Any bound of the form* $\|R_k^{(\ell)}\| \leq \rho^{\ell}$ *for some* $\rho > 0$, *would suffice by taking* $\kappa > 0$ *small enough so that* $\rho^{\ell} = O(n(d-1)^{\ell/2})$. *It can slightly shorten the proof.*

3 New eigenvalues of random lifts

We now introduce the model of random lifts and present an analog of Theorem 1 in this new context. The notation is independent from the previous section. Let us first introduce a convenient representation of multi-graphs. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite simple graph with vertex set V and edge set $E = \{e_t : t \in T\}$ where $e_t = \{x_t, y_t\}$. The set of directed edges is the set of pairs formed by the edges :

$$\vec{E} = \{(x, y) : \{x, y\} \in E\} \subset V^2.$$

We have $|\vec{E}| = 2|E|$. We further assume that V comes with a vertex map $\iota : V \to \iota(V)$. The vertex map acts naturally on V^2. The triple $X = (V, E, \iota)$ will be called a multi-graph on the actual vertex set $\iota(V)$. This definition allows for multi-edges that is $e, f \in \vec{E}$ such that $\iota(e) = \iota(f)$ and loops, i.e. edges such that $\iota(e) = (u, u)$. The adjacency matrix A of X is the symmetric matrix indexed on $\iota(V)$ defined for all $u, v \in \iota(V)$ by

$$A_{uv} = \sum_{(x,y) \in V^2} \mathbf{1}(\iota(x, y) = (u, v))\mathbf{1}(\{x, y\} \in E).$$

The non-backtracking matrix B of X is the matrix indexed on $\vec{E}$ defined for all $e, f \in \vec{E}$ by

$$B_{ef} = \mathbf{1}(\iota(e_2) = \iota(f_1))\mathbf{1}(f \neq e^{-1}).$$

where if $e = (x, y)$, $e_1 = x$, $e_2 = y$ and $e^{-1} = (y, x)$. We set $r = |\vec{E}|$ and let

$$\rho_1 \geq \cdots \geq |\rho_r|$$

be the eigenvalues of B with multiplicities. We shall assume that B is an irreducible matrix (it is equivalent to X connected and $|E| > |\iota(V)|$, see [13]). Then, the Perron eigenvalue ρ_1 is larger than 1 and it is the growth rate of the universal covering tree of X.

Definition 19 (Lifts). *For integer $n \geq 1$, S_n^E is the family of permutations $\sigma = (\sigma_e)_{e \in \vec{E}}$ such that $\sigma_{e^{-1}} = \sigma_e^{-1}$ for all $e \in \vec{E}$. A n-lift of X (also referred as a n-covering of X) is a multi-graph $X_n = (V_n, E_n, \iota_n)$ with vertex set and vertex map*

$$V_n = V \times \{1, \cdots n\} \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_n(x, i) = (\iota(x), i),$$

such that, for some $\sigma \in S_n^E$,

$$E_n = \Big\{\{(x, i), (y, \sigma_e(i))\} : e = (x, y) \in \vec{E}\Big\}.$$

We write $X(\sigma)$ for the n-lift associated to $\sigma \in S_n^E$. An edge $((x, i), (y, \sigma_e(i))) \in \vec{E}_n$ with $e = (x, y)$ will simply be denoted by (e, i), so that $(e, i)^{-1} = (e^{-1}, \sigma_e(i))$.

We say that X_n is a random n-lift if, for any $e \in \vec{E}$, σ_e is a uniformly distributed permutation and $(\sigma_{(x,y)}, \sigma_{(y,x)})_{\{x,y\} \in E}$ are independent variables.

Let X_n be a n-lift as above and B_n be the non-backtracking matrix X_n. We consider the vector subspace H of $\mathbb{R}^{\vec{E}_n}$,

$$H = \left\{ f \in \mathbb{R}^{\vec{E}_n} : f(e,i) = f(e,1) \text{ for all } i \geq 1,\, e \in \vec{E} \right\}. \tag{39}$$

The dimension of H is r. For $e \in \vec{E}$, we define the vector $\chi_e \in \mathbb{R}^{\vec{E}_n}$ by $\chi_e(f,i) = \mathbf{1}(e = f)$. The orthogonal of H is

$$H^{\perp} = \left\{ f \in \mathbb{R}^{\vec{E}_n} : \langle \chi_e, f \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } e \in \vec{E} \right\}.$$

It is straightforward to check that $B_n H \subset H$, $B_n^* H \subset H$ and the restriction of B_n to H is B. It follows that the spectrum of B_n contains the spectrum of B (with multiplicities). We will denote the $nr - r$ new eigenvalues of B_n by λ_i with

$$|\lambda_1| \geq \cdots \geq |\lambda_{nr-r}|. \tag{40}$$

They are the eigenvalues of the restriction of B_n to $H^{\perp}$. The main result of this section is the following improvement on [13, Theorem 0.2.6].

Theorem 20. *Let X be a finite multi-graph whose non-backtracking matrix B is irreducible and let B_n be the non-backtracking matrix of X_n, a random n-lift of X. If the new eigenvalues of B_n are denoted as in* (40) *and ρ_1 is the Perron eigenvalue of B, then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(|\lambda_1| \geq \sqrt{\rho_1} + \varepsilon) = 0.$$

Arguing as above, if A_n is the adjacency matrix of X_n, then the spectrum of A_n contains the spectrum of A. We may similarly define the new eigenvalues of A_n as the remaining eigenvalues. If X is a d-regular multi-graph, then the Ihara-Bass formula (11) remains valid. As a by-product of Theorem 20, we deduce the following corollary,

Corollary 21 (Friedman and Kohler [13])**.** *Let X be a finite d-regular multi-graph with $d \geq 3$ and let A_n be the adjacency matrix of X_n, a random n-lift of X. If $|\mu_1|$ is the largest absolute value of the new eigenvalues of A_n, then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(|\mu_1| \geq 2\sqrt{d-1} + \varepsilon \Big) = 0.$$

If d is even and X is a bouquet of $d/2$-loops then by standard contiguity results, Corollary 21 implies Friedman's Theorem 1. Also, coming back to Theorem 20, Angel, Friedman and Hoory [5] proved that $\sqrt{\rho_1}$ is the spectral radius of the non-backtracking operator of T, the universal covering tree of X. In [11], Friedman conjectures similarly that, for a random n-lift, the new eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix have absolute value bounded by $\rho + o(1)$ where ρ is the spectral radius of the adjacency operator of T. In the case of d-regular multi-graphs, T is an infinite d-regular tree and $\rho = 2\sqrt{d-1}$: it follows that Corollary 21 is consistent with the conjecture. For the general case, the best known result is due to Puder [27] who proves the upper bound $\sqrt{3}\rho + o(1)$ for the new eigenvalues. For a large class of local operators, one may expect that the new eigenvalues of a random n-lift will be bounded by $\rho + o(1)$ where ρ is the spectral radius of this operator on T. This phenomenon can be thought as the analog of the weak Ramanujan property for arbitrary graphs. Theorem 20 is an illustration of this phenomenon for the specific case of the non-backtracking operator.

4 Proof of Theorem 20

Theorem 20 is proved as Theorem 2. The path decomposition and the probabilistic estimates will be sligthly simpler for the permutations rather than the matching of Theorem 2. On the other end, since the multi-graph X is arbitrary, the path counting argument will be a litttle more involved. The notation will be as close as possible to the notation used in Section 2.

4.1 Path decomposition

In this subsection, we fix $\sigma \in S_n^E$ and consider its associated n-lift, $X_n = X(\sigma)$ and B_n its non-backtracking matrix. Our aim is to derive a deterministic upper bound on the new eigenvalue of B_n. To this end, similarly to Subsection 2.2, with a slight abuse of notation, we set $\vec{E}_n = \vec{E} \times \{1, \cdots, n\}$ so that, if $\mathbf{e} = (e, i)$ and $\mathbf{f} = (f, j)$,

$$(B_n)_{\mathbf{ef}} = \mathbf{1}(\iota(e_2) = \iota(f_1))\mathbf{1}(f \neq e^{-1})\mathbf{1}(\sigma_e(i) = j).$$

Elements in $\vec{E}_n$ will be called half-edges. Let H be as in (39) and P be the orthogonal projection on H. Since $B_n H \subset H$ and $B_n^* H \subset H$, we have the decomposition $B_n = P B_n P + (I - P) B_n (I - P)$. We apply Lemma 3 to $S = P B_n^\ell P$ and $R = B_n^\ell - S = (I - P) B_n^\ell (I - P)$. We find that for the new eigenvalues of B_n,

$$|\lambda_1| \leq \sup_{x \in H^\perp, \|x\|_2 = 1} \|B_n^\ell x\|_2^{1/\ell}, \tag{41}$$

The right hand side of the above expression can be studied by an expansion of paths in the graph. We first adapt Definitions 4-5 to our new setting.

Definition 22 (Paths and Tangles). *For a positive integer k, let $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k)$ with $\gamma_t = (e_t, i_t) \in \vec{E}_n$, $e_t = (x_t, y_t)$, $v_t = (x_t, i_t)$,*

- *If for all $t \geq 1$, $e_{2t} = e_{2t-1}^{-1}$, the sequence γ is* admissible. *The set of admissible sequences is denoted by Π^k.*
- *If $\gamma \in \Pi^k$, the set of visited vertices, edges and pairs of half-edges are denoted by $V_\gamma = \{v_t : 1 \leq t \leq k\}$, $\hat{E}_\gamma = \{\{v_{2t-1}, v_{2t}\} : 1 \leq t \leq k\}$ and $E_\gamma = \{\{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\} : 1 \leq t \leq k\}$. We denote the multi-graph associated to γ by $G_\gamma = (V_\gamma, \hat{E}_\gamma, \iota_n)$. (Note that E_γ and $\hat{E}_\gamma$ are in bijection and elements in E_γ will also be called edges).*

- *If $\gamma \in \Pi^k$ and for all $t \geq 1$, $\iota_n(v_{2t+1}) = \iota_n(v_{2t})$ and $e_{2t+1} \neq e_{2t}$, the sequence γ will be called a* non-backtracking path.

- *The set Γ^k is the set of non-backtracking paths. If $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in \vec{E}_n$, we denote by $\Gamma^k_{\mathbf{ef}}$ paths in Γ^k such that $\gamma_1 = \mathbf{e}$, $\gamma_k = \mathbf{f}$. The sets F^k and $F^k_{\mathbf{ef}}$ will denote the subsets of tangle-free paths in Γ^k and $\Gamma^k_{\mathbf{ef}}$ (see Definition 5).*

For $e = (x, y) \in \vec{E}$, let M_e be the permutation matrix associated to σ_e, defined for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, by

$$(M_e)_{ij} = \mathbf{1}(\sigma_e(i) = j). \tag{42}$$

Observe that $M_{e^{-1}} = M_e^* = M_e^{-1}$. If $\mathbf{e} = (e, i)$, $\mathbf{f} = (e^{-1}, j)$, we also set

$$M_{\mathbf{ef}} = M_{\mathbf{fe}} = (M_e)_{ij}.$$

Then, by construction, for any $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in \vec{E}_n$,

$$(B_n^k)_{\mathbf{ef}} = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma^{2k+1}_{\mathbf{ef}}} \prod_{s=1}^{k} M_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}},$$

and, if X_n is ℓ-tangle-free and $0 \leq k \leq \ell$,

$$B_n^k = B_n^{(k)}, \tag{43}$$

where

$$(B_n^{(k)})_{\mathbf{ef}} = \sum_{\gamma \in F^{2k+1}_{\mathbf{ef}}} \prod_{s=1}^{k} M_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}}.$$

We denote by J the matrix on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with all entries equal to 1. Then, we introduce for $\mathbf{e} = (e, i)$, $\mathbf{f} = (e^{-1}, j)$,

$$\underline{M}_e = M_e - \frac{J}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{M}_{\mathbf{ef}} = \underline{M}_{\mathbf{fe}} = (\underline{M}_e)_{ij},$$

(observe that M_e is a stochastic matrix and $\underline{M}_e$ is the orthogonal projection of M on $\mathbf{1}^\perp$). We define the matrix on $\mathbb{R}^{\vec{E}_n}$, for $0 \leq k \leq \ell$,

$$(\underline{B}_n^{(k)})_{\mathbf{ef}} = \sum_{\gamma \in F^{2k+1}_{\mathbf{ef}}} \prod_{s=1}^{k} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}}. \tag{44}$$

We use the convention that a product over an empty set is equal to 1. We use the same telescopic sum decomposition than in (18), we find

$$(B_n^{(\ell)})_{\mathbf{ef}} \quad = \quad (\underline{B}_n^{(\ell)})_{\mathbf{ef}} + \sum_{\gamma \in F^{2\ell+1}_{\mathbf{ef}}} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \prod_{s=1}^{k-1} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \prod_{k+1}^{\ell} M_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}}. \tag{45}$$

We rewrite (45) as a sum of matrix products of $\underline{B}_n^{(k)}$ and $B_n^{(k)}$ up to some remainder terms. We denote by K the matrix on $\mathbb{R}^{\vec{E}_n}$ defined by

$$K = B \otimes J.$$

where $\otimes$ is the usual tensor product and J is as above.

For $1 \leq k \leq m-1$, T_k^m is the set of $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_m)$ such that (i) $\gamma' = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k) \in F^k$, (ii) $\gamma'' = (\gamma_{k+1}, \ldots, \gamma_m) \in F^{m-k}$, and (iii) $G_{(\gamma', \delta, \gamma'')}$ is tangled with $(\gamma_k, \delta, \gamma_{k+1}) \in \Gamma^3$ (if $\gamma_t = (e_t, i_t)$, $\delta = (e_k^{-1}, i_{k+1})$ and $B_{e_k e_{k+1}} = 1$). Then, if $T^m_{k,\mathbf{ef}}$ is the subset of $\gamma \in T_k^m$ such that $\gamma_1 = \mathbf{e}$ and $\gamma_m = \mathbf{f}$, we set

$$(R_k^{(\ell)})_{\mathbf{ef}} = \sum_{\gamma \in T^{2\ell}_{2k-1,\mathbf{ef}}} \prod_{s=1}^{k-1} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2s-1}\gamma_{2s}} \prod_{k}^{\ell-1} M_{\gamma_{2s}\gamma_{2s+1}}. \tag{46}$$

Summing over γ_{2k} in (45), we find that

$$B_n^{(\ell)} \quad = \quad \underline{B}_n^{(\ell)} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \underline{B}_n^{(k-1)} K B_n^{(\ell-k)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} R_k^{(\ell)}.$$

Observe that if $x \in H^\perp$,

$$Kx = (B \otimes J_n)x = 0 \quad \text{ and } \quad B_n H^\perp \subset H^\perp.$$

Hence, if X_n is ℓ-tangle free and $x \in H^\perp$, then, from (43), we find

$$B_n^{(\ell)} x \quad = \quad \underline{B}_n^{(\ell)} x - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} R_k^{(\ell)} x.$$

Putting this last inequality in (41), the outcome of this subsection in the following lemma.

Lemma 23. *Let $\ell \geq 1$ be an integer and $\sigma \in S_n^E$ be such that $X_n = X(\sigma)$ is ℓ-tangle free. Then, if the new eigenvalues of B_n are as in (40), we have*

$$|\lambda_1| \leq \left(\|\underline{B}_n^{(\ell)}\| + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \|R_k^{(\ell)}\| \right)^{1/\ell}.$$

4.2 Computation on the random lifts

In the remainder of this section, $X_n = X(\sigma)$ where σ is uniform on S_n^E. Our first lemma checks that X_n is ℓ-tangle free if ℓ is not too large. For $u = (x, i) \in V_n$ and $v = (z, i) \in \iota_n(V_n)$, the half-edges adjacent to a vertex is defined as

$$E_n(u) = \left\{ (e, i) : e = (x, y) \in \vec{E} \right\} \subset \vec{E}_n \quad \text{ and } \quad E_n(v) = \bigcup_{u : \iota_n(u) = v} E_n(u).$$

The degree of an actual vertex $w \in \iota_n(V)$ is $|E_n(w)|$ (the degrees are the row sums of A_n). We set

$$d = \max_{v \in \iota(V_n)} |E_n(v)|. \tag{47}$$

Note that d is independent of n and it is equal to the maximal degree in X.

Lemma 24. *Let $\ell \sim \kappa \log_{d-1} n$ with $0 \leq \kappa < 1/4$. Then w.h.p. X_n is ℓ-tangle free.*

Proof. The proof is a simple adaptation of Lemma 7. We fix $v = (z, i) \in \iota_n(V_n)$ and we explore its neighborhood by revealing sequentially the permutations $\sigma = (\sigma_e)_{e \in E}$. The exploration at each step picks a vertex of $\iota_n(V_n)$ and an adjacent edge and reveals its neigbor. We start with $D_0 = E_n(v)$. At stage $t \geq 0$, if D_t is not empty, take an element $a_{t+1} = (e_{t+1}, i_{t+1})$ in D_t with $e_{t+1} = (x_{t+1}, y_{t+1})$ and (x_{t+1}, i_{t+1}) at minimal graph distance from v (we break ties with lexicographic order). We set $u_{t+1} = (y_{t+1}, \sigma_{e_{t+1}}(i_{t+1}))$. If $b_{t+1} = (e^{-1}_{t+1}, j_{t+1}) \in D_t$, we set $D_{t+1} = D_t \backslash \{a_{t+1}, b_{t+1}\}$, and, otherwise,

$$D_{t+1} = (D_t \cup E(u_{t+1})) \backslash \{a_{t+1}, b_{t+1}\}.$$

At stage $\tau \leq nr$, D_τ is empty and we have explored the connected component of v. Before stage

$$m = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell-1} d(d+1)^{k-1} = O\Big((d+1)^\ell\Big),$$

we have revealed the subgraph spanned by the vertices at distance at most ℓ from v. Also, if v has two distinct cycles in its ℓ-neighborhood, then $S(v) = S_{\tau \wedge m} \geq 2$. where, for $t \geq 1$,

$$S_t = \sum_{s=1}^{t} \varepsilon_s \quad \text{ and } \quad \varepsilon_t = \mathbf{1}(b_t \in D_{t-1}).$$

At stage $t \geq 0$, for any $e \in E$, at most t values of σ_e have been discovered and $|D_t| \leq d + (d-1)(t-1)$.

We will denote by $\mathcal{F}_t$ the σ-algebra generated by $(D_0, \cdots, D_t)$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}_t}$ the conditional probability distribution. Then, τ is a stopping time and, if $t < \tau \wedge m$, $F_t = \{(e^{-1}_{t+1}, i) \in D_t : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$, and $n_t \leq t$ is the number of $s \leq t$ such that a_s or b_s is of the form (e^{-1}_{t+1}, i), we find

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}_t}(\varepsilon_{t+1} = 1) = \frac{|F_t|}{n - n_t} \leq c\Big(\frac{m}{n}\Big) = q.$$

Hence, $S(v)$ is stochastically dominated by a $\mathrm{Bin}(m, q)$ variable. Arguing as in Lemma 7, from the union bound,

$$\mathbb{P}(G \text{ is } \ell\text{-tangled}) \leq \sum_{v=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(S(v) \geq 2) \leq \sum_{v=1}^{n} q^2 m^2 = O\Big(\frac{(d-1)^{4\ell}}{n}\Big).$$

It concludes the proof of Lemma 24. $\square$

For $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_k) \in \Pi^k$, with $\gamma_t = (e_t, i_t)$, $e_t = (x_t, y_t)$, $v_t = (x_t, i_t)$ we say that an edge $\{\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f}\} \in E_\gamma$ is *consistent*, if $\{t : \mathbf{e} \in \{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\}$ or $\mathbf{f} \in \{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\}\} = \{t : \{\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f}\} = \{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\}\}$. It is inconsistent otherwise. The *weight* of $y \in E_\gamma$ is $\sum_t \mathbf{1}(\{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\} = y)$.

Proposition 25. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for any $\gamma \in \Pi^k$ with $2k \leq \sqrt{n}$ and any $k_0 \leq k$, we have,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{t=1}^{k_0} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}} \prod_{t=k_0+1}^{k} M_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}} \right| \leq c \, 9^b \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^a \left(\frac{4k}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{a_1},$$

where $a = |E_\gamma|$, b is the number of inconsistent edges of γ and a_1 is the number of $1 \leq t \leq k_0$ such that $\{\gamma_{2t-1}, \gamma_{2t}\}$ is consistent and has weight 1 in E_γ.

Proof. Step 1 : reduction to a single edge. We set $\gamma_t = (e_t, i_t)$. We consider a total order on V and set $E^+ = \{(x, y) \in \vec{E} : x < y\}$. Up to reversing γ_{2t-1} and γ_{2t}, we may assume without loss of generality that each edge $\{x, y\} \in E$ is always visited in the same sense: if $x < y$, (x, y) appears on odd edges e_{2t-1} and (y, x) appears on even edges e_{2t}. Since the random permutations $(\sigma_e)_{e \in E^+}$ are independent, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{t=1}^{k_0} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}} \prod_{t=k_0+1}^{k} M_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}} = \prod_{e \in E^+} \mathbb{E} \prod_{1 \leq t \leq k_0 \,:\, e_{2t-1} = e} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}} \prod_{k_0+1 \leq t \leq k \,:\, e_{2t-1} = e} M_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}}$$

It thus suffices to prove the statement for $\gamma \in \Pi^k$ such that for some $e \in \vec{E}$ and all $t \geq 1$, $e_{2t-1} = e$. We make this assumption in the remainder of the proof.
Step 2 : we assume that all edges are consistent. We may now essentially repeat the proof of Proposition 25. For ease of notation, we set $e = (x, y)$, $\gamma_{2t-1} = (e, i_t)$, $\gamma_{2t} = (e^{-1}, j_t)$, $\sigma = \sigma_e$, $\underline{M} = \underline{M}_e$. We have $\hat{E}_\gamma = \{f_1, \ldots, f_a\}$ with $f_t = \{u_t, v_t\}$, $u_t = (x, i_t)$, $v_t = (y, j_t)$. We also set

$$J^* = \{1, \ldots, n\} \backslash \{j_t : 1 \leq t \leq a\}.$$

In particular, since all edges are consistent, $|J^*| = n - a$. The weight of y_t is denoted by w_t. We have $w_t = p_t + q_t$, where p_t is the weight of y_t in $(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{k_0})$. For integer p, we introduce the sets $T_p = \{t : p_t = p, q_t = 0\}$ and $T' = \{t : q_t \geq 1\}$. Since $M_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$, we find

$$w = \prod_{t=1}^{k_0} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}} \prod_{t=k_0+1}^{k} M_{\gamma_{2t-1}\gamma_{2t}} = \mathbf{1}_\Omega \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^h \prod_{p \geq 1} \prod_{t \in T_p} \underline{M}_{i_t j_t}^p, \tag{48}$$

where $h = \sum_{t \in T'} p_t$ and Ω is the event $\{\forall t \in T', \sigma(i_t) = j_t\}$. We further define S_p as the set of $t \in T_1$ such that for some $s \in T_p \backslash \{t\}$, $\sigma(i_t) = j_s$ or $\sigma(i_s) = j_t$. Also, $\hat{S}_p$ is the set of $t \in T_p$ such that $\sigma(i_t) = j_s$ or $\sigma(i_s) = j_t$ for some $s \in T_1 \backslash \{t\}$. We have $S_1 = \hat{S}_1$. We set $T_1^* = T_1 \backslash \cup_p S_p$ and for $p \geq 2$, $T_p^* = T_p \backslash \hat{S}_p$. If δ is the number of $t \in S_p \cap S_q$ for some $1 \leq p < q$, we have the relation

$$|T_1^*| = a_1 - \sum_p |S_p| + \delta.$$

With our new variables, (48) may be rewritten as

$$w = \mathbf{1}_\Omega \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^h \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\sum_p (p|\hat{S}_p| + |S_p|) - \delta - |\hat{S}_1|} \prod_{p \geq 1} \prod_{t \in T_p^*} \underline{M}_{i_t j_t}^p. \tag{49}$$

Now, we define $\mathcal{F}$ the filtration generated by the variables $T_1^*, \sigma(i_t), \sigma^{-1}(j_t), t \notin T_1^*$. By construction, for $t \in T_1$, the events Ω and $\{t \in T_1^*\}$ are $\mathcal{F}$-measurable. If $\hat{N}$ is the number of $t \in T_1^*$ such that $\sigma(i_t) \neq j_t$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mathcal{F} \prod_{t \in T_1^*} \underline{M}_{i_t j_t} = \mathbb{E}_\mathcal{F} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{|T_1^*| - \hat{N}} \left(-\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\hat{N}}.$$

Let $\hat{n} = n - a - \sum_{p \geq 2} \sum_{t \in T_p^*} \mathbf{1}(\sigma(i_t) \in J^*)$. If Ω holds, the law of $\hat{N}$ given $\mathcal{F}$ is given, for $0 \leq x \leq |T_1^*|$, by

$$\mathbb{P}_\mathcal{F}(\hat{N} = x) = \frac{\binom{|T_1^*|}{x} (\hat{n})_x}{Z} \quad \text{with} \quad Z = \sum_{x=0}^{|T_1^*|} \binom{|T_1^*|}{x} (\hat{n})_x.$$

First, since $\hat{n} \geq n - 2a$ and $a \leq \sqrt{n}$, we deduce from (20),

$$Z \geq c \sum_{x=0}^{|T_1^*|} \binom{|T_1^*|}{x} \hat{n}^x = c(1+n)^{|T_1^*|} \geq c n^{|T_1^*|}.$$

Also, if Ω holds, arguing as in Proposition 8,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mathcal{F} \prod_{t \in T_1^*} \underline{M}_{i_t j_t} &= \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{x=0}^{|T_1^*|} \binom{|T_1^*|}{x} \prod_{y=0}^{x-1} (y - \hat{n}) \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{|T_1^*| - x} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^x \\ &= \frac{1}{Z} \mathbb{E} \prod_{y=0}^{N-1} (y - \hat{n}), \end{aligned}$$

where N has distribution $\mathrm{Bin}(|T_1^*|, 1/n)$. By Lemma 9, we deduce that, if Ω holds,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_\mathcal{F} \prod_{t \in T_1^*} \underline{M}_{i_t j_t} \right| \leq c \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}\right)^{|T_1^*|},$$

with $\varepsilon = 4a/\sqrt{n}$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{F}_t$ be the filtration generated by $\sigma(i_s), \sigma^{-1}(j_s), s \neq t$. For any t,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}_t}(M_{i_t j_t} = 1) = \frac{\mathbf{1}(\Omega_t^c)}{n - a + 1} \leq \frac{1}{n^*},$$

where $n^* = n - a + 1$ and $\Omega_t \in \mathcal{F}_t$ is the event that for some $s \neq t$, $\sigma(i_s) = j_t$ or $\sigma^{-1}(j_s) = i_t$. We get, for $p \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_t} |\underline{M}_{i_t j_t}|^p \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{F}_t} |\underline{M}_{i_t j_t}|^2 \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^2 \frac{1}{n^*} + \frac{1}{n^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n^*}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n^*}.$$

If $\mathcal{F}'$ is the the filtration generated by $\sigma(i_t), \sigma^{-1}(j_t), t \notin T'$, the same argument gives,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}'}(\Omega) \leq \left(\frac{1}{n^*}\right)^{|T'|}.$$

It remains to putting these bounds together, we deduce fron (20) and (49) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbb{E}w| &\leq c\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{|T'|} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}\right)^{|T_1^*|} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\sum_p (p|\hat{S}_p| + |S_p|) - \delta - |\hat{S}_1|} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\sum_{p\geq 2} |T_p^*|} \\
&= c\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{a-a_1} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}\right)^{a_1} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}\right)^{-\sum_p |S_p| + \delta} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\sum_p (p|\hat{S}_p| + |S_p|) - \delta - \sum_p |\hat{S}_p|} \\
&\leq c\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{a-a_1} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}\right)^{a_1} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\sum_{p\geq 2}(p|\hat{S}_p| - \frac{1}{2}|S_p|) - \sum_{p\geq 2} |\hat{S}_p|} \varepsilon^{-|S_1|}.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude as in the proof of Proposition 8 that Proposition 25 holds when all edges are consistent. *Step 3 : extension to inconsistent edges.* Let us say that $\mathbf{e} = (e, i) \in E_\gamma$ is inconsistent of degree $\delta \geq 2$, if there exist distinct $\mathbf{f}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{f}_\delta$, $\mathbf{f}_s = (e^{-1}, j_s)$, such that for all $1 \leq i \leq \delta$, $\{\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f}_i\}$ is in E_γ. We say that $\mathbf{f} = (e^{-1}, j) \in E_\gamma$ is inconsistent of degree δ if the mirror condition occurs. The degree of inconsistency of γ is defined as the sum of the degrees of γ_s. The degree of inconsistency of γ, say $\hat{b}$, is at most $2b$. With these definitions, we conclude exactly as in the proof of Proposition 8. ☐

4.3 Path counting

In this subsection, we give upper bounds on the operator norms of $\underline{B}_n^{(\ell)}$ and $R_k^{(\ell)}$ defined by (44) and (46). We will use the trace method and, up to minor changes, the argument will be parallel to Subsection 2.5.

4.3.1 Operator norm of $\underline{B}_n^{(\ell)}$

We denote by $\|\cdot\|_1$ the ℓ^1-norm in $\mathbb{R}^{\vec{E}}$ and, for $e \in \vec{E}$, we define the unit vector $\delta_e(f) = \mathbf{1}(e = f)$. The following holds for any $k \geq 1$ and $e \in \vec{E}$,

$$\|B^k \delta_e\|_1 \leq (d-1)^k, \tag{50}$$

where d was defined in (47). Moreover,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|B^k \delta_e\|_1^{1/\ell} = \rho_1,$$

where ρ_1 is the Perron eigenvalue of B. In this paragraph, we consider a scalar $\rho > 1$ and an integer ℓ_0 such that

$$\|B^k \delta_e\|_1 \leq \rho^k \quad \text{for all } k \geq \ell_0 \text{ and } e \in \vec{E}. \tag{51}$$

We will prove the following proposition.

Proposition 26. *Let ρ, ℓ_0 as in (51) and $1 \leq \ell \leq \log n$. Then, w.h.p.*

$$\|\underline{B}_n^{(\ell)}\| \leq (\log n)^{20} \rho^{\ell/2}.$$

To be precise, in Proposition 26, $\ell = \ell(n)$ may depend on n but ρ, ℓ_0 are constants (and what is hidden behind *w.h.p.* depends on ρ, ℓ_0). For the main part, we repeat the proof of Proposition 11. Let m be a positive integer. Arguing as in (26),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\underline{B}_n^{(\ell)}\|^{2m} &\leq \operatorname{tr}\Big\{\Big(\underline{B}_n^{(\ell)} \underline{B}_n^{(\ell)*}\Big)^m\Big\} \\ &= \sum_\gamma \prod_{i=1}^{2m} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{i,2t-1}\gamma_{i,2t}}, \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where the sum is over all $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{2m})$ such that $\gamma_i = (\gamma_{i,1}, \ldots, \gamma_{i,2\ell+1}) \in F^{2\ell+1}$ and for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$,

$$\gamma_{2i,1} = \gamma_{2i+1,1} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{2i-1,2\ell+1} = \gamma_{2i,2\ell+1},$$

with the convention that $\gamma_{2m+1} = \gamma_1$. The product (52) does not depend on the value of $\gamma_{i,2\ell+1}$, $1 \leq i \leq 2m$, and, if $\gamma_{i,2\ell}$ is given, $\gamma_{i,2\ell+1}$ can take $d_{i,2\ell} - 1$ possible values where $d_{i,2\ell}$ is the degree of $\iota(x_{i,2\ell})$ in X with $\gamma_{i,t} = (e_{i,t}, j_{i,t})$, $e_{i,t} = (x_{i,t}, y_{i,t})$. Hence, by setting $\gamma'_{2i,t} = \gamma_{2i,2\ell+1-t}$ in the right hand side of (52), we get

$$\|\underline{B}_n^{(\ell)}\|^{2m} \leq \sum_{\gamma \in W_{\ell,m}} p(\gamma) \prod_{i=1}^{2m} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{i,2t-1}\gamma_{i,2t}}, \tag{53}$$

where $W_{\ell,m}$ is the set of $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{2m}) \in \Pi^{2\ell \times 2m}$ such that $\gamma_i = (\gamma_{i,1}, \ldots, \gamma_{i,2\ell}) \in F^{2\ell}$ and for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$,

$$\iota_n(v_{2i,1}) = \iota_n(v_{2i-1,2\ell}) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{2i+1,1} = \gamma_{2i,2\ell}, \tag{54}$$

with the convention that $\gamma_{2m+1} = \gamma_1$, $v_{i,t} = (x_{i,t}, j_{i,t})$ and

$$p(\gamma) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} (d_{2i-1,2\ell} - 1) \leq (d-1)^m.$$

Permutations on vertices act naturally on Π^k : for $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Pi^k$, we consider the isomorphism class $\gamma \sim \gamma'$, if there exists $(\sigma_x)_{x \in V} \in S_n^V$ such that, with $\gamma_t = (e_t, j_t)$, $\gamma'_t = (e'_t, j'_t)$, $e_t = (x_t, y_t)$, $e'_t = (x'_t, y'_t)$, for all $1 \leq t \leq k$, $e'_t = e_t$ and $j'_t = \sigma_{x_t}(j_t)$. We may define a canonical element in each isomorphic class as follows. For $x \in V$, we define $V_\gamma(x) = \{v_t : x_t = x\}$. We say that a path $\gamma \in \Pi^k$ is canonical if for all $x \in V$, $V_\gamma(x) = \{(x, 1), \ldots, (x, |V_\gamma(x)|)\}$ and the vertices of $V_\gamma(x)$ are visited in the lexicographic order. The number of paths in each isomorphic class is easily upper bounded.

Lemma 27. *Let $\gamma \in \Pi^k$ with $|V_\gamma| = s$ then γ is isomorphic to at most n^s elements in Π^k.*

Proof. For $x \in V$, let $s_x = |V_\gamma(x)|$. By construction, $\sum_x s_x = s$ and γ is isomorphic to

$$\prod_x \frac{n!}{(n-s_x)!} \leq \prod_x n^{s_x} = n^s,$$

as requested. $\square$

We now upper bound the number of isomorphic classes in $W_{\ell,m}$. The next lemma contains the only noticeable difference with Subsection 2.5.

Lemma 28. *Let $\mathcal{W}_{\ell,m}(s,a)$ be the subset of canonical paths in $W_{\ell,m}$ with $|V_\gamma| = s$ and $|E_\gamma| = a$. There exists a constant κ depending on ℓ_0, ρ and X such that, we have*

$$|\mathcal{W}_{\ell,m}(s,a)| \leq \rho^s (\kappa \ell m)^{8m(a-s+1)+10m}.$$

Proof. We start by recalling some definitions used in the proof of Lemma 13. For $i \leq i \leq 2m$ and $1 \leq t \leq \ell$, let $a_{i,t} = (\gamma_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t})$ and $b_{i,t} = \{\gamma_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t}\} \in E_\gamma$. We explore the sequence $(a_{i,t})$ in lexicographic order denoted by $\preceq$. We say that (i,t) is a *first time*, if $v_{i,2t}$ has not been seen before (that is $v_{i,2t} \neq v_{i',t'}$ for all $(i',t') \preceq (i,2t)$). The edge $b_{i,t}$ will then be called a *tree edge* (the graph with edge set $\{\{v_{i,2t-1}, v_{i,2t}\} : (i,t) \text{ first time}\}$ is a tree). An edge $b_{i,t}$ which is not a tree edge, is called an *excess edge* and we then say that (i,t) is an *important time*. We denote the important times by (i, t_q^i), $1 \leq q \leq q_i$ and set $t_0^i = 0$, $t_{q_i+1}^i = \ell + 1$. We observe that between (i, t_{q-1}^i) and (i, t_q^i), there is a $t_{q-1}^i < \tau_{q-1}^i \leq t_q^i$ such that $b_{i,t}$ is a tree edge for all $t_{q-1}^i < t < \tau_{q-1}^i$ and then (i,t) is a first time for all $\tau_{q-1}^i \leq t < t_q^i$. We set $s_{q-1}^i = t_q^i - \tau_{q-1}^i$. Since every vertex in V_γ different from $(x_1, 1)$ has its associated tree edge,

$$\chi = |\{y \in E_\gamma : \ y \text{ is an excess edge}\}| = a - s + 1,$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2m} \sum_{q=0}^{q_i} s_q^i = s - 1. \tag{55}$$

We mark the important times (i, t_q^i), $1 \leq q \leq q_i$ by the vector $(\gamma_{i,2t_i^q}, \gamma_{i,2\tau_q^i - 1}, \varepsilon_{i,q})$ where, by convention, for $q = q_i$, $\gamma_{i,2\ell+1} = \gamma_{i+1,1}$ and $\varepsilon_{i,q} = (e_{i,2\tau_q^i - 1}, \cdots, e_{i,2t_{q+1}^i - 1})$ is the projection of the path $(\gamma_{i,2\tau_q^i - 1}, \cdots, \gamma_{i,2t_{q+1}^i - 1})$ on X. Similarly, for $q = 0$, we add a starting mark, $(\gamma_{i,2\tau_0^i - 1}, \varepsilon_{i,0})$ with $\varepsilon_{i,0} = (e_{i,1}, \cdots, e_{i,2t_1^i - 1})$. We observe two facts (i) there is a unique non-backtracking path between two vertices of a tree, and (ii) if (i,t) is a first time then $\gamma_{i,2t} = (e_{i,2t}, k+1)$ and $\gamma_{i,2t+1} = (e_{i,2t+1}, k+1)$, where k is the number of previous first times $(i',t') \preceq (i,t)$, such that $x_{i',2t'-1} = x_{i,2t}$, with $e_{i,t} = (x_{i,t}, y_{i,t})$ (since γ is canonical). It follows that we can reconstruct $\gamma \in \mathcal{W}_{\ell,m}(s,a)$ from the starting marks, the position of the important times and their marks. It gives a first encoding.

This encoding may have large number of important times. To improve it, we partition important times into three categories, *short cycling*, *long cycling* and *superfluous* times. For each i, consider the first time (i, t_1) such that $v_{i,2t_1} \in \{v_{i,1}, \ldots, v_{i,2t_1-1}\}$. If such time exists, the short cycling time (i,t) is the last important time $(i,t) \preceq (i,t_1)$. We have $t = t^i_q$ for some $1 \leq q \leq q_i$. Let $1 \leq \sigma \leq t_1$ be such that $v_{i,2t_1} = v_{i,2\sigma-1}$. By assumption, $C_i = (\gamma_{i,2\sigma-1}, \cdots, \gamma_{i,2t_1})$ will be the unique cycle visited by γ_i. We denote by $(i,\hat{t}) \succeq (i,t)$ the first time that $\gamma_{i,2\hat{t}-1}$ in not in C_i (by convention $\hat{t} = \ell+1$ if γ_i remains on C_i). We modify the mark of the short cycling time $(i,t) = (i,t^i_q)$ and redefine it as $(\gamma_{i,2t^q_i}, \gamma_{i,2t_1}, \hat{t}, \gamma_{i,2\hat{t}-1}, \gamma_{i,2\hat{\tau}^i_q-1}, \hat{\varepsilon}_{i,q})$, where $(i,\hat{\tau}^i_q)$, $\hat{\tau}^i_q \geq \hat{t}$, is the first time that $b_{i,\hat{\tau}^i_q}$ is not on the tree constructed so far and $\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,q} = (e_{i,2\hat{\tau}^i_q-1}, \cdots, e_{i,2t^i_{q+1}-1})$. We also redefine s^i_q as $t^i_{q+1} - \hat{\tau}^i_q$. Important times (i,t) with $1 \leq t < \sigma$ or $\tau \leq t \leq k$ are called long cycling times. The other important times are called superfluous. Then, for each $1 \leq i \leq 2m$, the number of long cycling times (i,t) is bounded by $\chi - 1$ (since there is at most one cycle, no edge of E_γ can be seen twice outside those of C_i, the -1 coming from the fact the short cycling time is an excess edge). We note also that, if (i,q) is a short cycling time and (i,q') is the next long cycling time then $\hat{\tau}^i_q$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}_{i,q}$ are equal to $\tau^i_{q'-1}$ and $\varepsilon_{i,q'-1}$. Moreover, $s^i_p = 0$ for all $q \leq p < q'-1$.

It gives our second encoding. We can reconstruct γ from the starting marks, the positions of the long cycling and the short cycling times and their marks. For each i, there are at most 1 short cycling time and $\chi - 1$ long cycling times. There are at most $\ell^{2m\chi}$ ways to position them. There are at most $\ell^{2m(\chi+1)}$ possibilities for the τ^q_i's (of the starting marks, long and short cycling times). There are r possible choices of $e_{1,1}$. If α is the number of different $\gamma_{i,t}$ in γ, there are at most $\alpha^2 \|B^{s^i_q} \delta_{e_{i,2\tau^i_q-1}}\|_1$ different possible marks for the long cycling time t^i_q and $\alpha^4 \ell \|B^{s^i_q} \delta_{e_{i,2\hat{\tau}^i_q-1}}\|_1$ possible marks for a short cycling time t^i_q. Similarly, there are at most $\alpha \|B^{s^0_q} \delta_{e_{i,2\hat{\tau}^i_0-1}}\|_1$ possibilities for the starting marks. Finally, from (50)-(51) and (55),

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2m} \prod_{q=0}^{q_i} \|B^{s^i_q} \delta_{e_{i,2\tau^i_q-1}}\|_1 \leq (d-1)^{2m(\chi+1)\ell_0} \rho^{s-1-2m(\chi+1)\ell_0}.$$

Since $\alpha \leq 2\ell m$, we deduce that $|\mathcal{W}_{\ell,m}(s,a)|$ is at most

$$r \ell^{2m\chi} \ell^{2m(\chi+1)} \left((2\ell m)^2\right)^{2m(\chi-1)} \left((2\ell m)^4 \ell\right)^{2m} (2\ell m)^{2m} (d-1)^{2m(\chi+1)\ell_0} \rho^{s-1-2m(\chi+1)\ell_0}.$$

It concludes the proof by setting κ large enough. □

For $\gamma \in W_{\ell,m}$, the average contribution of γ in (53) is

$$\mu(\gamma) = \mathbb{E} \prod_{i=1}^{2m} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell} \underline{M}_{\gamma_{i,2t-1}\gamma_{i,2t}}. \tag{56}$$

A straightforward adaptation of Lemma 14 gives the following.

Lemma 29. *There is a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that, if $4\ell m \leq \sqrt{n}$ and $\gamma \in W_{\ell,m}$ with $|V_\gamma| = s$, $|E_\gamma| = a$, we have*

$$|\mu(\gamma)| \leq \kappa^{a-s+1+m} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^a \left(\frac{(8\ell m)^2}{n}\right)^{(2s-a-2-(\ell+2)m)_+}.$$

Proof of Proposition 26. For $n \geq 3$, we define

$$m = \left\lfloor \frac{\log n}{17 \log(\log n)} \right\rfloor . \tag{57}$$

For this choice of m, $n^{1/(2m)} = o(\log n)^9$ and $\ell m = o(\log n)^2$. Hence, from (53) and Markov inequality, it suffices to prove that

$$S = \sum_{\gamma \in W_{\ell,m}} |\mu(\gamma)| \leq n(c\ell m)^{10m} \rho^{\ell' m}, \tag{58}$$

where $\ell' = \ell + 2$ and $\mu(\gamma)$ was defined in (56). Observe that if $\gamma \in W_{\ell,m}$, $|V_\gamma| - 1 \leq |E_\gamma| \leq 2\ell m$. Also, if $\gamma \sim \gamma'$ then $\mu(\gamma) = \mu(\gamma')$. Hence, using Lemma 27, Lemma 28 and Lemma 29, we find

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \sum_{a=s-1}^{\infty} n^s \rho^s (\kappa \ell m)^{8m(a-s+1)+10m} \kappa^{a-s+1+m} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^a \left(\frac{(8\ell m)^2}{n}\right)^{(2s-a-2-\ell' m)_+} \\ &\leq S_1 + S_2 + S_3 \end{aligned}$$

where S_1 is the sum over $\{1 \leq s \leq \ell' m, s-1 \leq a\}$, S_2 over $\{\ell' m + 1 \leq s, s-1 \leq a \leq 2s-2-\ell' m\}$, and S_3 over $\{\ell' m + 1 \leq s, 2s-1-\ell' m \leq a\}$. We have for some constant $c > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\leq cn\kappa^m (\kappa \ell m)^{10m} \sum_{s=1}^{\ell' m} \rho^s \sum_{a=s-1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\kappa(\kappa \ell m)^{8m}}{n}\right)^{a-s+1} \\ &\leq n(c\ell m)^{10m} \rho^{\ell' m} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\kappa(\kappa \ell m)^{8m}}{n}\right)^p . \end{aligned}$$

For our choice of m in (31), for n large enough,

$$\frac{(\kappa \ell m)^{8m}}{n} \leq \frac{(\log n)^{16m}}{n} \leq n^{-1/17}.$$

In particular, the above geometric series converges and, adjusting the value of c, the right hand side of (58) is an upper bound for S_1. The treatment of S_2 and S_3 is exactly parallel to the treatment of S_2 and S_3 in the proof of Proposition 11 with ℓ' and ρ replacing k' and $d-1$. It concludes the proof. ☐

4.3.2 Operator norm of $R_k^{(\ell)}$

We now repeat the argument for $R_k^{(\ell)}$. This a routine extension of the previous paragraph and Subsection 2.5.2.

Proposition 30. *Let ρ, ℓ_0 as in (51) and $1 \leq \ell \leq \log n$. Then w.h.p. for any $1 \leq k \leq \ell$,*

$$\|R_k^{(\ell)}\| \leq (\log n)^{40} \rho^{\ell - k/2}.$$

Let m be a positive integer. Arguing as in (34)-(53), we find

$$\|R_k^{(\ell)}\|^{2m} \leq \sum_{\gamma \in X^k_{\ell,m}} p(\gamma) \prod_{i=1}^{2m} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell-1} M^{(i,t)}_{\gamma_{i,2t-1}\gamma_{i,2t}}, \tag{59}$$

where $X^k_{\ell,m}$ is the set of $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{2m}) \subset \Pi^{2(\ell-1)\times 2m}$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, $\gamma_{2i-1} \in T^{2\ell-2}_{2k-2}$, $\gamma_{2i} \in T^{2\ell-2}_{2\ell-2k}$, $\iota_n(v_{2i,1}) = \iota_n(v_{2i-1,2\ell-2})$ and $\gamma_{2i+1,1} = \gamma_{2i,2\ell-2}$, with the convention that $\gamma_{2m+1} = \gamma_1$ and $\gamma_{i,t} = (e_{i,t}, j_{i,t})$, $e_{i,t} = (x_{i,t}, y_{i,t})$, $v_{i,t} = (x_{i,t}, j_{i,t})$. In (59), we have set $M^{(i,t)}_{ef} = \underline{M}_{ef}$ if i is odd and $t \leq k-1$ or i even and $t \geq \ell - k + 1$, otherwise $M^{(i,t)}_{ef} = M_{ef}$. Finally,

$$0 \leq p(\gamma) \leq (d-1)^{3m},$$

accounts for the terms which have been summed as in (34) and (53).

Let $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_{2m}) \in X^k_{\ell,m}$. We write $\gamma_i = (\gamma'_i, \gamma''_i)$ where, if i odd, $\gamma'_i = (\gamma_{i,1}, \ldots, \gamma_{i,2k-2})$ and $\gamma''_i = (\gamma_{i,2k-1}, \ldots, \gamma_{i,2\ell-2})$, while, if i even, $\gamma'_i = (\gamma_{i,1}, \ldots, \gamma_{i,2\ell-2k})$ and $\gamma''_i = (\gamma_{i,2\ell-2k+1}, \ldots, \gamma_{i,2\ell-2})$. Arguing as in (36), we have

$$|V_\gamma| \leq |E_\gamma|. \tag{60}$$

As in the previous paragraph, we upper bound the number of isomorphism classes in $X^k_{\ell,m}$.

Lemma 31. *Let $\mathcal{X}^k_{\ell,m}(s,a)$ be the subset of canonical paths in $X^k_{\ell,m}$ with $|V_\gamma| = s$, $|E_\gamma| = a$. There exists a constant κ depending on ℓ_0, ρ and X such that, we have*

$$|\mathcal{X}^k_{\ell,m}(s,a)| \leq \rho^s (\kappa \ell m)^{16m(a-s+1)+24m}.$$

Proof. We adapt the proof of Lemma 28, using the extra input of the proof of Lemma 17. For $1 \leq i \leq 2m$ odd, we set $k_i = k$ and for i even $k_i = \ell - k + 1$. To each i, we say that γ_i is connected or disconnected whether $G_{\gamma''_i}$ intersects the graph $H_i = \cup_{j<i} G_{\gamma_j} \cup G_{\gamma'_i}$ or not. If γ_i is disconnected, we define for $1 \leq t \leq \ell - 1$, $a_{i,t} = (\gamma_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t})$. If γ_i is connected, for $1 \leq t \leq k_i - 1$, we set $a_{i,t} = (\gamma_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t})$, and if $\sigma_i \geq k_i$ is the first time such that $v_{i,2\sigma_i} \in H_i$, we set for $k_i \leq t \leq \sigma_i$, $a_{i,t} = (\gamma_{i,2(\sigma_i+k_i-t)}, \gamma_{i,2(\sigma_i+k_i-t)-1})$ and for $\sigma_i + 1 \leq t \leq \ell - 1$, $a_{i,t} = (\gamma_{i,2t-1}, \gamma_{i,2t})$. We then explore the sequence $(a_{i,t})$ in lexicographic order. The definition of $b_{i,t}$, first time, tree edge and excess edge carry over, that is (i,t) is a first time if the end vertex of $a_{i,t}$ has not been seen before. When γ_i is connected, we add the extra mark $(\sigma_i, \gamma_{i,2\sigma_i}, \gamma_{i,2\tau-1}, \varepsilon_i)$ where (i,τ), $\tau > \sigma_i$, is the next time that $b_{i,t}$ will not be a tree edge of the tree constructed so far and $\varepsilon_i = (e_{i,2\tau-1}, \ldots, e_{i,2t'-1})$ is the projection of $(\gamma_{i,2\tau-1}, \ldots, \gamma_{i,2t'-1})$ on X and (i,t') the next important time. If γ_i is disconnected this extra mark is set to be $e_{i,2k_i-1}$. With our ordering, all vertices of $V_\gamma \backslash \{\gamma_{1,1}\}$ will have an associated tree edge, at the exception of $v_{i,2k_i-1}$ when γ_i is disconnected. If δ is the number of disconnected γ_i's, we deduce that there are $\delta + a + s - 1$ excess edges and there are at most $\chi = a + s - 1$ excess edges in each connected component of G_γ. It follows that the analog of (55) is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2m} \sum_{q=0}^{q_i} s^i_q = s - 1 - \delta \leq s - 1,$$

where, as in the proof of Lemma 28, s_q^i is the number of new vertices between two successive important times.

We now repeat the proof of Lemma 28 with the difference that for each i, we use that γ'_i and γ''_i are tangled free, it gives short cycling times and long cycling times for both γ'_i and γ''_i. Then, for each i, there are at most 2 short cycling times and $2(\chi-1)$ long cycling times. Arguing as in Lemma 28, we get that $|\mathcal{X}^k_{\ell,m}(s,a)|$ is upper bounded by

$$r\ell^{4m\chi}\ell^{4m(\chi+1)}\left((2\ell m)^2\right)^{4m(\chi-1)}\left((2\ell m)^4\ell\right)^{4m}(2\ell m)^{2m}(d-1)^{4m(\chi+1)\ell_0}\rho^{s-1-4m(\chi+1)\ell_0}r^{2m}((2\ell m)^2\ell)^{2m},$$

where the factor $r^{2m}((2\ell m)^2\ell)^{2m}$ accounts for the extra marks. Taking κ large enough, we obtain the claimed statement. ☐

For $\gamma \in X^k_{\ell,m}$, the average contribution of γ in (53) is

$$\nu(\gamma) = \mathbb{E}\prod_{i=1}^{2m}\prod_{t=1}^{\ell-1} M^{(i,t)}_{\gamma_{i,2t-1}\gamma_{i,2t}}.$$

A straightforward extension of Lemma 18 gives the following.

Lemma 32. *There is a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that, if $4\ell m \leq \sqrt{n}$ and $\gamma \in X^k_{\ell,m}$ with $|V_\gamma| = s$, $|E_\gamma| = a$, we have*

$$|\nu(\gamma)| \leq \kappa^{a-s+1+m}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^a\left(\frac{(8\ell m)^2}{n}\right)^{(2s-a-2-(2\ell-k+6)m)_+}.$$

Proof of Proposition 30. For $n \geq 3$, we define

$$m = \left\lfloor \frac{\log n}{33\log(\log n)} \right\rfloor. \tag{61}$$

For this choice of m, $\ell m = o(\log n)^2$. Hence, from (59) and Markov inequality, it suffices to prove that for some constant $c > 0$,

$$S = \sum_{\gamma\in X^k_{\ell,m}} |\nu(\gamma)| \leq (c\ell m)^{40m}\rho^{k''m}, \tag{62}$$

with $k'' = 2\ell - k + 6$. Since $\nu(\gamma)$ is constant on each isometric class, using (60), Lemma 27, Lemma 31 and Lemma 32, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \sum_{s=1}^{\infty}\sum_{a=s}^{\infty} n^s\rho^s(\kappa\ell m)^{16m(a-s+1)+24m}\kappa^{a-s+1+m}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^a\left(\frac{(8\ell m)^2}{n}\right)^{(2s-a-2-k''m)_+} \\ &\leq S_1 + S_2 + S_3, \end{aligned}$$

where S_1 is the sum over $\{1 \leq s \leq k''m, s \leq a\}$, S_2 over $\{k''m + 1 \leq s \leq a \leq (2s - 2 - k''m)\}$, and S_3 over $\{k''m + 1 \leq s, 2s - 1 - k''m \leq a\}$. We may then repeat the proof of Proposition 11 where k'' replaces k'. For example, for some constant $c > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\leq \kappa^{m+1} (\kappa \ell m)^{40m} \sum_{s=1}^{k''m} \rho^s \sum_{a=s}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\kappa (\kappa \ell m)^{16m}}{n} \right)^{a-s} \\ &\leq (c \ell m)^{40m} \rho^{k''m} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\kappa (\kappa \ell m)^{16m}}{n} \right)^{p}. \end{aligned}$$

For our choice of m in (61), we have, for n large enough, $(\kappa \ell m)^{16m}/n \leq n^{-1/33}$. Hence, the above geometric series converges and the right hand side of (62) is an upper bound for S_1. The treatment of S_2 and S_3 is exactly parallel to the treatment of S_2 and S_3 in the proof of Proposition 11. It concludes the proof. ☐

4.4 Proof of Theorem 20

All ingredients are finally gathered. Let $1 < \rho_1 \leq d - 1$ be the Perron eigenvalue of B. We fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\ell \sim \kappa \log_{d-1} n$ for some $0 < \kappa < 1/4$. We may take $\rho \leq d - 1$ in (51) such that $\sqrt{\rho} \leq \sqrt{\rho_1} + \varepsilon$. By Lemma 24 and Lemma 23, if Ω is the event that X_n is ℓ-tangle free,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\lambda_1| \geq \sqrt{\rho_1} + 2\varepsilon) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|\lambda_1| \geq \sqrt{\rho} + \varepsilon; \Omega) + o(1) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\Big(J^{1/\ell} \geq \sqrt{\rho} + \varepsilon \Big) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $J = \|\underline{B}_n^{(\ell)}\| + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \|R_k^{(\ell)}\|$. On the other end, by Propositions 26-30, w.h.p.

$$J \leq (\log n)^{15} \rho^{\ell/2} + \frac{(\log n)^{40}}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \rho^{\ell - k/2} \leq (\log n)^{15} \rho^{\ell/2} + o(1),$$

since $\rho^\ell = O(n^\kappa)$. Finally, for our choice of ℓ, $(\log n)^{15/\ell} = 1 + O(\log \log n / \log n)$.

References

[1] L. Addario-Berry and S. Griffiths. The spectrum of random lifts. arXiv:1012.4097, 2010.

[2] N. Alon. Eigenvalues and expanders. *Combinatorica*, 6(2):83–96, 1986. Theory of computing (Singer Island, Fla., 1984).

[3] A. Amit and N. Linial. Random graph coverings. I. General theory and graph connectivity. *Combinatorica*, 22(1):1–18, 2002.

[4] A. Amit and N. Linial. Random lifts of graphs: edge expansion. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 15(3):317–332, 2006.

[5] O. Angel, J. Friedman, and S. Hoory. The non-backtracking spectrum of the universal cover of a graph. arXiv:0712.0192, 2007.

[6] B. Bollobás. *Random graphs*, volume 73 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2001.

[7] C. Bordenave, M. Lelarge, and L. Massoulié. Non-backtracking spectrum of random graphs: community detection and non-regular ramanujan graphs. 2015.

[8] A. Broder and E. Shamir. On the second eigenvalue of random regular graphs. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, SFCS '87, pages 286–294, Washington, DC, USA, 1987. IEEE Computer Society.

[9] S. Brooks and E. Lindenstrauss. Non-localization of eigenfunctions on large regular graphs. *Israel J. Math.*, 193(1):1–14, 2013.

[10] F. R. K. Chung. *Spectral graph theory*, volume 92 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997.

[11] J. Friedman. Relative expanders or weakly relatively Ramanujan graphs. *Duke Math. J.*, 118(1):19–35, 2003.

[12] J. Friedman. A proof of Alon's second eigenvalue conjecture and related problems. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 195(910):viii+100, 2008.

[13] J. Friedman and D.-E. Kohler. The relativized second eigenvalue conjecture of alon. arXiv:1403.3462, 2014.

[14] Z. Füredi and J. Komlós. The eigenvalues of random symmetric matrices. *Combinatorica*, 1(3):233–241, 1981.

[15] S. Hoory, N. Linial, and A. Wigderson. Expander graphs and their applications. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 43(4):439–561 (electronic), 2006.

[16] M. Kotani and T. Sunada. Zeta functions of finite graphs. *J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo*, 7(1):7–25, 2000.

[17] N. Linial and D. Puder. Word maps and spectra of random graph lifts. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 37(1):100–135, 2010.

[18] E. Lubetzky, B. Sudakov, and V. Vu. Spectra of lifted Ramanujan graphs. *Adv. Math.*, 227(4):1612–1645, 2011.

[19] A. Lubotzky, R. Phillips, and P. Sarnak. Ramanujan graphs. *Combinatorica*, 8(3):261–277, 1988.

[20] A. Marcus, D. A. Spielman, and N. Srivastava. Interlacing families i: Bipartite ramanujan graphs of all degrees. available on `http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.4132`.

[21] G. A. Margulis. Explicit group-theoretic constructions of combinatorial schemes and their applications in the construction of expanders and concentrators. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 24(1):51–60, 1988.

[22] L. Massoulié. Community detection thresholds and the weak ramanujan property. arXiv:1311.3085v1, 2013.

[23] B. D. McKay. Subgraphs of random graphs with specified degrees. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Southeastern Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing, Vol. II (Baton Rouge, La., 1981)*, volume 33, pages 213–223, 1981.

[24] B. D. McKay, N. C. Wormald, and B. Wysocka. Short cycles in random regular graphs. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 11(1):Research Paper 66, 12 pp. (electronic), 2004.

[25] E. Mossel, J. Neeman, and A. Sly. A proof of the block model threshold conjecture. arXiv:1311.4115v2, 2013.

[26] A. Nilli. On the second eigenvalue of a graph. *Discrete Math.*, 91(2):207–210, 1991.

[27] D. Puder. Expansion of random graphs: New proofs, new results. arXiv:1212.5216, 2012.

[28] J.-P. Serre. Répartition asymptotique des valeurs propres de l'opérateur de Hecke T_p. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 10(1):75–102, 1997.

[29] A. Terras. *Zeta functions of graphs*, volume 128 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011. A stroll through the garden.

Charles Bordenave
Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse. CNRS and University of Toulouse III.
118 route de Narbonne. 31062 Toulouse cedex 09. France.
E-mail: `bordenave@math.univ-toulouse.fr`
http://www.math.univ-toulouse.fr/~bordenave